DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 933 HE 024 769

AUTHOR Acostaromero, Salvador
TITLE Structure and Governance of Universities in France, the United States of America, and Mexico.
PUB DATE 9 Jul 91
NOTE 176p.; Master's Thesis, University of Washington.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; *College Administration; *Comparative Education; Educational Change; Educational History; Enrollment Trends; Foreign Countries; *Governance; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Political Issues; Political Parties; Student Role; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *France; *Mexico; United States

ABSTRACT

This thesis reviews the main elements of university governance in France, the United States, and Mexico. A brief historical overview of higher education in the three countries precedes an individual analysis. The analysis of university governance in France focuses on the 1968 reform of higher education prompted by student protests and the 1983 reforms launched by the Socialist government. The chapter devoted to the governance of American colleges and universities highlights some changes that have occurred over the last 50 years, such as the role of state government, central administration, faculty unions, and senates. For the Mexican section, the National Autonomous University of Mexico was chosen as the focus of study, with emphasis on the relationship between the university and the federal government. The last chapter identifies four chief elements that appear to be decisive in promoting change in university governance: (1) increases in student enrollments and the consequent expansion of the system of higher education; (2) relationships between civil government and universities; (3) the degree of involvement of political parties in the universities; and (4) the place occupied by the students in the formal organization and government of universities. Includes 80 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334933

Structure and Governance of Universities in France, the United States of America, and Mexico.

by

Salvador Acostaromero

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

University of Washington

1991

Approved by _____
(Chairperson of Supervisory Committee)

_____

Program Authorized
to Offer
Degree: Education

Date: 5/17/91

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SALVADOR ACOSTAROMERO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 024 761

© Copyright 1991

Salvador Acostaromero

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Any other reproduction for any purposes or by any means shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature

Date Jul 9, 1991

University of Washington

Abstract

Structure and Governance of Universities
in France, the United States of America,
and Mexico.

by Salvador Acostaromero

Chairperson of the Supervisory Committee:
Associate Professor. Donald T. Williams, College of Education.

This thesis reviews the main elements of university governance in France, the United States of America, and Mexico. After a brief historical overview of higher education in these three countries, the main elements of university governance are analyzed.

The analysis of university governance in France focuses on the 1968 reform of higher education prompted by the student protest in the same year, as well as on the 1983 reform launched by the Socialist government. The comparison is interesting because the two reforms addressed primarily governance issues in French universities.

The chapter devoted to the governance of American colleges and universities highlights some changes that occurred over the last fifty years. Special attention is given to those changes in the role of state government, central administration, faculty unions, and senates in conducting American colleges and universities. The American chapter offered an opportunity to review two theoretical approaches employed to explain the relationship between governance and structural change.

For the Mexican section, the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) was chosen as the focus of study. The main subject analyzed here was the relationship between the UNAM and the federal government for the latter exerts a strong influence in the governance of the former.

The last chapter identifies, in the line of educational reform, four chief elements that, in the three countries studied, appear to be decisive in promoting change in university governance: a) increases in student enrollments and the consequent expansion of the system of higher education, b) relationships between civil government and universities, c) the degree of involvement of political parties in the universities, and d) the place occupied by the students in the formal organization and government of universities.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter I.- Structure and Governance of French Universities. The 1968 and the 1983 Reforms.

The French Institutions of Higher Education. 14
French Higher Education, a historical overview. 25
The 1968 and 1983 Reforms of Higher Education. 47
1968 and 1983, Towards a Conclusion 61

Chapter II.- Some Factors Influencing the Evolution of Governance in American Universities.

History of American Higher Education, a brief overview 69
The Main Sectors of American Higher Education 73
American Higher Education and the Government 78
Special Features of American Higher Education 82
Governance of American Universities. An Overview of Some of its Elements. 85
Some Theoretical Approaches to Change in American University Governance. 92
Some Changes in the Governance of American Universities. 99
Summary 108

Chapter III.- The National Autonomous University of Mexico, A Case of University Governance.

Types of Institutions in Mexico 114
Relationships Between Higher Education and the Civil Government 119
The National Autonomous University of Mexico 124

Chapter IV.- Conclusions 147

Bibliography 158

List of Tables

Page

1. Distribution of university students according to socioeconomic origin in several fields of study, 1979..... 21

2. Enrollments in French higher education, 1975-1976..... 22

3. Distribution of enrollments in the faculties of French universities, 1960-61, 1976-77, and 1983-84..... 23

4. Funds for research, 1984..... 25

5. Number of Institutions of higher education in the United States of America, 1970 and 1987..... 74

6. Enrollments in institutions of higher education in the United States of America, 1970 and 1987..... 76

7. Number of states in each category of coordinating agency..... 103

8. Enrollments by type of institution of higher education in Mexico, 1977-1984..... 114

9. Financial sources of Mexican universities, 1970, 1976, and 1981..... 119

The author wishes to recognize the contributions he received from the University of Washington Professors Alan Klockars, Ellis Evans, Stephanie Shea, John T.S. Keeler, Betty Malen, Kenneth Ostrander, David Madsen, Pamela Keating, Robert G. Cope, Michael Knapp, and Stephen Kerr. Specially helpful were the comments made by Steve Olswang during the preparation of this work. Despite all this help, however, the author would not have been able to accomplish this thesis without the wise advice, support, encouragement, and friendship granted to him by a true professor, Donald T. Williams.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my wife Lilia and to my sons José Román and Bernardo who, besides giving me their unconditional support, prevented me of thinking that school, library, and papers were the most important thing in life.

Introduction

The main purpose of this study is to analyze, in a comparative perspective, the general patterns that characterize the organization and governance of universities in three nations: France, the United States of America, and Mexico.

Previous comparisons have been done that include the French and the American systems,[1] and only two studies, have been identified, that put Mexican higher education in an international perspective.[2] There are some books dealing with the characteristics of Mexican higher education, but the comparative approach is not present in these studies.[3] However, a detailed description of the relationship between government and universities in Mexico can be found in the study of Daniel C. Levy.[4] Having such scarcity of research on the characteristics of Mexican universities, a brief exploration of a specific part of them, namely organization and governance, appears indispensable.

In that task, the comparative approach promises to be fruitful. In the comparison of different systems of higher education we can expect to know the features of the "other" systems, but an unexpected result may be a deeper comprehension of one's own system. Burton R. Clark believes that cross-national comparison is especially useful in re-discovering the unique features of one's own system of higher

education since the comparative approach uncovers unconscious assumptions about it. "The 'hometown' view [he wrote referring to the American analyses] has been particularly damaging in the study of higher education, since a large share of the literature has been written by Americans, and the US system, in its fundaments, is a deviant case."[5] The most common kind of perspective is, logically, of the "hometown" kind, and as Robert Cowen affirmed, the research perspective is rarely international or comparative.[6]

Therefore, a study of the characteristics of organization and governance in French, American, and Mexican universities may provide a better understanding of each country's peculiarities, as well as a broader comprehension of the different shapes that university structure and governance may adopt in adjusting to national conditions. The present analysis follows the steps set by Clark in doing his study of the academic organization in a cross-national perspective. Clark wrote "My purpose is to improve the state of the art by detailing systematically how higher education is organized and governed. The approach is twofold: to set forth the basic elements of the higher education system, as seen from an organizational perspective; and to show how those features may vary across nations with fateful effects."[7]

The understanding of how universities in the three countries are organized and governed may be a step towards a

more broad understanding of how particular structures and styles of government within universities may foster or block institutional change and university adjustment to new conditions. Presumably, knowing how the universities are organized and managed, the effects of such structures upon institutional renovation can be better observed. It has to be said, however, that the present work attempts only to gain a general but contrasted comprehension of how French, American, and Mexican universities manage their essential functions.

The selection of countries

A general justification must be offered as to the selection of the countries to be analyzed. It was already mentioned that French and American universities have been compared in the context of other nations. Clearly, the inclusion of Mexico may provide a new angle of vision on them. It can also benefit the analysis of Mexican universities from an international perspective.

Presently, the Mexican universities are striving to solve many problems derived in part from a rapid student population growth. These problems along with financial stringencies have shaped a real crisis in the Mexican higher education.[8] In this period of crisis, to look at different experiences may help to sharpen the comprehension of the processes affecting the Mexican universities, and, of course,

it may broaden our perspectives on the search for solutions to specific problems.

In doing the comparison of the three countries we already know the existence of many similarities between Mexico's and France's systems of higher education. Statism is one of these common characteristics, given that the national government, in the two countries, seems to hold a great deal of authority in steering universities. In France, university administration has recently been modified by the 1968 and the 1984 laws for the Orientation of Higher Education.[9] The Mexican government, on its own, has intended to set the plans for higher education development by means of installing a National System for the Planning of Higher Education.

On the other side, considering the same characteristic, government control upon institutions, American universities are more flexibly linked to state governments. American colleges and universities in the United States do not seem to respond to a particular level of government nor to a single social group, yet they appear to be very susceptible to market circumstances. This feature is important to the extent that it may foster a more diversified and free development of educational institutions, a characteristic observed by Goldschmidt in a comparative study: "Precisely because they are not tied together under a single administrative organization, the individual institutions can pursue their own initiatives..."[10]

A few words are necessary as to the use of the term *system*, which will be pervasive in this study. The concept has proven to be useful in social sciences in spite of the relative vagueness that it purports. Clark has found that the idea of *system* is one "...we can hardly do without even when plagued by its ambiguity and shifting meanings. When we use the term, we construct boundaries, arbitrary definitions of relevant actors and structures that fashion insiders and outsiders."[11] By creating such conceptual boundaries, it also allows a clear reference to a number of elements pertaining to the realm of higher education. A slightly different meaning is assigned by Eurich to the concept when he affirmed to use the word system loosely "...as meaning the whole operation, recognizing it is not a formal structure but a scene with multiple parts or sectors that are interacting more and more frequently."[12]

Specific Objectives

The focus of this study is the analysis of the predominant pattern of the organizational structure and governance practices of the universities in three nations, France, USA, and Mexico. Van de Graaff and Clark propose six levels to study authorities ruling the universities.[13] These levels were taken here as a basic classification useful in guiding the research process and analysis. Those levels are: "From bottom to top...the institute or department, the

faculty (in the European sense, as a unit of organization for a professional training or a cluster of disciplines), the university, the multicampus system, state government, and national government. The first three are encompassed by the traditional university, and the last three lie above it."[14]

Since the present analysis has been made employing the terms of organization, governance, and decision-making, an operational definition of them is needed. *Organization* is used here to refer to the formal setting of the different elements constituting an institution. In this sense, the organization of a university would include basically the bodies and units participating in the governing process in the three levels mentioned above. The concept of *structure*, often used here as a synonym of organization, purports the sense of hierarchical arrangements among the different elements of the structure, as well as the existence of more or less stable relationships among them. Fundamental to these relationships are the legal norms ruling the elements of the structure.

In addition, organization normally refers to the specific manner in which the institutional components are integrated. Councils, schools, and departments, for instance, are essential components of French, American, and Mexican universities. They are integrated, however, in different ways, and they also have different functions within the institutions of the three countries.

Governance on its own, is the process of conducting the essential functions and development of an individual university. The governing process is the specific way in which decisions are taken to pursue institutional objectives and to achieve specific goals. In general, the governing process may be subdivided into two parts: a) determination of general policies for a specific institution, and b) the administration or current institutional operation. This study intends to focus in the first part of the process. Formally, the university's government is held by its bodies or units in each level; they are given legal capacity to decide on matters of their own competence. The governance function is nowadays more important because of the expansion and increasing importance of the universities as institutions. Altbach affirms that "...academic institutions have become much more complicated and their governa ce has required careful planning. No longer does a small academic oligarchy of the senior professors manage small and relatively simple institutions. Modern universities are as complex as corporations, government departments or other massive institutions. In a sense, they are more complicated because they have an overlay of traditional professorial governance on what has become a large bureaucratic entity."[15]

Decision making becomes, in this context, the specific process of choosing one among several options to direct a particular action. Decision making denotes, in the

context of university governance, the specific actions performed by university bodies or officers to govern the institutions. Although decision making is a process pervasive in every level of administration the attention here will be focused on key decisions in governance: those that set standards and/or norms and which, therefore, determine the future development of colleges and universities. Such a process should perhaps be referred to as policy-making instead of the generic label of decision making insofar as the decisions comprised in the latter are essentially the application of standards or norms to specific situations encountered by administrators. Policies are a key issue because, in words of Baldridge, "(M)ajor policies commit the organization to definite goals, and in general determine the long-range destiny of the organization....policy decisions are those that bind the organization to important courses of action."[16]

Among the dozens of decisions usually made within universities, the emphasis will be on those regarded as playing a key role in university development. Some of them are:

a) general policies for university expansion or reorientation,

b) appointment of academic heads and administrative officers,

c) budget formulation and resource allocation,

d) curriculum-related decisions,

e) public relations-related decisions, and

f) decisions on the nature and direction of scientific research.

These areas of decision-making coincide almost completely with the areas chosen by Van de Graaff and others in analyzing the forms of authority in seven countries. They proposed to focus on "...(O)verall planning and policy making, budget and finance, student admissions and access, curricula and examinations, appointment of senior and junior staff, and research."[17]

The main research questions are concerned with a) the predominant organizational pattern of the universities in France, the United States, and Mexico, b) the specific units and bodies of university governance in the three countries, and c) the nature of the decision-making process in university governance. Some of these guiding questions are:

- What are the predominant patterns of university organization and governance in France, USA, and Mexico?

- What are the bodies, units, and administrative posts that hold governing powers in the universities of the three countries?

- What is the relationship among the governing units and bodies in the French, American, and Mexican universities? How are the decision powers distributed among the governance structure in the three countries?

Another topic is that of the relationships between universities and civil government, regarding university governance. A key issue is the existence of governmental policies directing the universities in the three countries. At least France and Mexico do have national policies dictated by the federal government in order to direct the universities' development.

The study of how policies are formulated, and how they affect the universities' governance, is a central matter. Another subject of study is the characteristics and functions of the bodies mediating between government and universities. In the case of the USA the role of state governments appears more important in relation to the existence of some educational policies for universities.

The questions below, addressing the relationship between universities and civil government, would be helpful in the analysis of the topic.

- What are the distinctive characteristics of public educational policies for universities in France, USA, and Mexico?

- What is the role of governmental (federal, state, or local) policies in the orientation and governance of universities in the three countries?

- What are the characteristics of intermediate bodies between universities and civil government in the three countries?

- How are those intermediate bodies related to university organization and governance in the three countries?

The presentation of results has been organized by countries: France, the United States, and Mexico. Preceding the analysis of university organization and governance in each country, a brief section is devoted to sketch the basic characteristics of the national systems of higher education in the three countries. The objective of such a section is to highlight the role of universities in the context of the national systems and to delineate the framework of higher education in the three countries. Those brief introductions are important to appraise the position of the universities within the system, especially in the cases of France and Mexico where other sectors comprising institutions of higher education other than universities exist; some of them often enjoy more prestige than the universities (as shown by the grandes écoles in France). The next sections of each chapter are entirely devoted to describe the characteristics of governance and structure of the universities in the three nations.

Notes to Introduction:

[1] Particularly well known are the books by Burton R. Clark. *The School and University: An International Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985; and John H. Van de Graaff et al. *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. New York: Praeger, 1978. A specific topic is cross-nationally analyzed in Lyman A. Glenny. *Funding Higher Education: A Six-Nation Analysis:* New York, Praeger, 1979.

[2] Kerr, Clark. *12 Systems of Higher Education. 6 Decisive Issues*. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1978; and Eurich, Nell P. *Systems of Higher Education in Twelve Countries. A Comparative View*. New York: Praeger, 1981. Apparently the two studies are based on the twelve national reports of higher education published in 1978 by the International Council for Educational Development. Two bibliographies consulted do not report international studies comparing Mexican universities to other countries' universities. See Philip G. Altbach. *Comparative Higher Education Abroad. Bibliography and Analysis*. New York: Praeger, 1976; and Philip G. Altbach & David H. Kelly. *Higher Education in International Perspective. A Survey and Bibliography*. London: Mansell Publishing Limited, 1985.

[3] McGinn, Noel and Susan L. Street. *Higher Education Policies in Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin, 1980; Osborn, Thomas Noel. *Higher Education in Mexico. History, Growth, and Problems in a Dichotomized Industry*. El Paso, Texas. Center for Inter-American Studies, 1976, and Sanchez, George I. *The Development of Higher Education in Mexico*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1944. Repr. in 1970.

[4] Levy, Daniel C. *University and Government in Mexico. Autonomy in an Authoritarian System*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980.

[5] Clark, Burton R. *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. p. 2.

[6] Cowen, Robert. "International Research on Higher Education." In UNESCO. *International Directory of Research Institutions on Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO-European Centre for Higher Education, 1987. p. ix.

[7] Clark, *The Higher Education System*. p.2.

[8] Guevara Niebla, Gilberto (ed). *La Crisis de la Educacion Superior en Mexico*. Mexico: Ed. Nueva Imagen, 1981. (Reprinted 1989)

[9] France is regarded in comparative higher education as the country of "administrative centralism." See Van de Graaff, *Academic Power*, p. 149.

[10] Goldschmidt, Dietrich. "Systems of Higher Education." In Van de Graaff, *Academic Power*, p. 151-2.

[11] Clark, *The Higher Education System*, p.4.

[12] Eurich, Nell P. Systems of Higher Education in Twelve Countries. p. x

[13] Van de Graaff, *Academic Power*, p.3-6; Clark, *The Higher Education System*, p. 108-110. The first author uses the expression "levels of organization" and the second refers to "levels of authority." The two scholars are, however, referring basically to the same matter.

[14] Van de Graaff, *Academic Power*, p. 3.

[15] Altbach, *Higher Education in International Perspective. A Survey and Bibliography*, p. 36.

[16] Baldridge, J. Victor. et. al. *Policy Making and Effective Leadership. A National Study of Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978. p. 34

[17] Van de Graaff, *Academic Power*, p. 6.

Chapter I.- Structure and Governance of French Universities. The 1968 and the 1983 Reforms

This chapter offers, first, a brief overview of the French educational system of higher education, a review of the history of French universities primarily during the nineteenth century and, finally, a more close review of two important reforms of the governance and regulations of French universities, those produced by the 1968 and the 1983 Orientation Laws for Higher Education. In the case of France, it is particularly interesting to look at the evolution of the universities because their basic organizational structure kept its original features, at least those related to means of governance and the traditional set of five faculties. Indeed, during the period from the turn of the century to the late 1960s, very few innovations took place within the universities and, apparently, the more dynamic role was played by the grandes écoles.

The French Institutions of Higher Education.

Before reviewing the impact of the 1968 and the 1983 Orientation laws upon university governance, it seems reasonable to take a glance on some statistics on French higher education as a means of gaining a general perception of the system. The three main components of this system are: universities, grandes écoles, and technical/vocational education programs.

Universities

The French universities differed, until 1968, from their counterparts in most of the world in that they were not comprehensive institutions. They were composed by the end of the nineteenth century of five types of schools, named faculties: law (which included the teaching of economics), letters (or arts), science, medicine (including dentistry), and pharmacy. In 1966 the *Institutes Universitaires du Technologie* (IUTs) were formally placed within the universities, though their governance and budget allocations were strictly dependent on the Ministry of Education. The IUTs were treated with the same rule applied to the previously established *Ecoles Nationales de Sciences de l'Ingenierie*: they belonged to the universities, but were governed by the Minister. There are in France a few private universities, but this thesis deals only with the public ones since they enroll more than 80% of the students. French public universities are mainly funded by the state, although there is a recent state policy encouraging them to look for funds from different sources, especially private ones, such as business and civil organizations. As a result of the reforms brought about by the 1968 Orientation Law for Higher Education, the different academic programs being offered by the five types of faculties were re-arranged into *unités d'enseignement et de recherche* (whose characteristics are

explained further in this chapter), and re-grouped into new universities.

Grandes Ecoles.

France has about two-hundred and fifty specialized schools or, as they are more often called, grandes écoles. Only half, according to Knowles, depend on the Ministry of Higher Education, and the rest are financed and supervised by the ministers of defense, industry, and agriculture. One fourth of the écoles are private institutions belonging to individuals or associations.[1]

Perhaps the most distinctive features of the écoles are their selectivity and elite character. As Van de Graaff and Furth observed, "All of the grandes écoles serve primarily to recruit and train persons to assume a broad range of high positions in the public and private sectors, in government and industry."[2] The écoles' selectivity is deeply rooted in their history, due in part to Napoleon, who in the early nineteenth century assigned them a strategic role in the preparation of military personnel and government officers.

At present, while French universities do not enroll students on the basis of an examination (they only require the aspirants to hold the *baccalaureate*), the grandes écoles demand that their candidates study a two-year course in the *Classe Preparatorie aux Grandes Ecoles*, after which students

are subjected to an extremely competitive examination. Naturally, most of the aspirants are not accepted. Asa Knowles reported that "...the student failure rate for the examination is about 70 percent, but those students who fail have the option of entering directly into the second cycle of a degree program at a university."[3] Because of that, universities are often regarded as second class institutions in France.

Traditionally, the grandes écoles have been responsible for preparing students in the fields of engineering, business, architecture, and teacher education among others. Some of the best known are the *Ecole Polytechnique,* the *Ecole National d'Administration* ("...which train the hard core of French technocrats in central government service..."[4]) the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales,* and the *Ecole Normale Superieur.*

Apparently the key to success for the grandes écoles has been their strict selectivity of the best students after two years of intense work, and their strong ties with government officials and industry leaders. On the other hand, the universities have confined themselves to educating for the traditional professional careers, and they have no restricted admissions. Thus, the grandes écoles are usually attacked on the basis of their exclusiveness, and the universities are regarded as crowded and wasteful institutions. The rivalry between the two types of

institutions is well expressed by Guy Neave's words, "Against the elite sector stands what one exquisitely qualified denizen of the grandes écoles once termed 'the university swamp.' Grouped around the faculties...its principal feature is its nonselective admissions policy."[5]

Institutes Universitaires du Technologie (IUTs).

In January 1966, the French government issued a decree creating the *Institutes Universitaires de Technologie* (IUTs) placing them within the university administrative framework. The IUTs had to train students who, after two years of preparation, would satisfy the need for skilled workers in industry. They would not be professionals, but *cadres moyens* (middle range technicians) who could commit themselves to "technical functions in production, applied research and the services."[6] This aim led to a highly loaded curriculum (32 class-hours a week) with a strong practice-oriented approach, which included four hours per week of apprenticeship experience.

This feature of the IUTs' curriculum did not occur within the universities; it resembled more that of the grandes écoles. A more remarkable difference, however, was that since their creation, the IUTs could select their students instead of admitting all the applicants. This practice, which countered the traditional "open-door" policy of the faculties, was only made possible thanks to the

special status the IUTs were given within the university structure.

Van de Graaff explained the process by which the legal and administrative status of the IUTs was defined. The first thing the IUTs planners decided was not to locate the new programs within the lycées, nor within the faculties. Prior experience with technical education in some lycées and in a few faculties of science had shown that successful programs in technical instruction were almost impossible in such institutions because of their "...structures and traditions. The necessity of an autonomous institution was evident." A more radical statement was made by the same author in regard to the capability of faculties in carrying out innovations, "In the past the few successful innovations in higher education -of which the *grandes écoles* are among the best examples had been established outside existing structures such as the university faculties."[7]

Thus the IUTs fell into the university administrative organization but had autonomy from the university authorities even though this meant a strong dependence on the government. Such autonomy was enhanced by the Ministry of Education to the extent that budget and personnel allocations were to be decided by the Ministry and, in the matter of appointing the IUT directors, the government kept the right to do that after a bureaucratic consultation with the university council. The internal supervisory body of

the IUTs was made small and simple. Each IUT was given a council consisting of six to twelve members, one third of them representatives of the IUTs teaching staff, another third from outside professions, and the last third representing the university, in addition to the director of the IUT and a representative of the IUTs alumni.

Such a governance structure allowed the IUTs a certain degree of freedom to govern themselves with minimal interference from the faculties or other members of the universities. In the case of their curricula, the IUTs were given a national curriculum by the Ministry of Education, though 20 percent of the class time had to be adapted to local and regional peculiarities. The IUTs' academic structure was composed of subject departments patterned after types of occupations among the secondary (industrial) and tertiary (services) sectors of the economy. The most pursued careers were, as reported by Van de Graaff, those in electronics, mechanics, and civil construction in the secondary sector and, in the tertiary, administration of public and private enterprises, business techniques, and data processing (*informatique*)..."[8]

One of the most surprising outcomes of the IUTs is that even though they were designed as an alternative to the faculties in enrolling students from the poorer families, many of those students have used the IUT programs as a step to further education in the universities. As noted by Van de

Graaff, "...their aim was to provide a terminal course of training...yet they appear to be providing a distinct channel of upward mobility for a markedly higher proportion of lower class youth than any other sector of higher education. "[9] This assertion is confirmed by the high proportion, 24.5%, of IUT students whose parents fell in 1979 into the category of blue collar workers as shown in the table below.

Table 1. Distribution of University students according to socioeconomic origin in several fields of study, 1979. (in percentages)

Status of Parents	Law	Humanit	Medicine	IUTs	All fields
Business owners	9.5	9.5	10.0	11.0	9.9
Professionals and senior executive	29.5	26.4	45.0	15.5	31.1
Junior Executive	15.5	17.0	15.0	17.0	16.5
White-collar workers	9.0	9.0	6.5	9.5	8.4
Blue-collar workers	12.0	13.5	7.0	**24.5**	12.2
Farmers	4.5	4.5	3.5	**9.5**	5.1

Source: Adapted from: Postlethwaite, T. Neville. *The Encyclopedia of Comparative Education and National Systems of Education.* Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press, 1988

Table 2 offers a synthetic view of the size of the student population in 1975-76 in each of the sectors of French higher education. The item "Grandes Ecoles" includes the preparatory classes whose graduates can apply for

admission to them; and the category "Technical Education" comprises the students at university institutes of technology (IUTs) as well as those in the *sections de techniciens superieurs*. The last item of the table includes some teacher education programs and institutions for literary and artistic education.

Table 2. Enrollments in French Higher Education, 1975-1976

		Percentages
Universities	771,941	76.0
Grandes Ecoles	107,875	10.6
Technical Education	89,742	8.8
Other Post-sec. Inst.	46,788	4.6
TOTAL	1,016,346	100.0%

Source: Bienaymé, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education: France*. New York: International Council for Educational Development/Interbook, 1978. p. 2

Student enrollment in the universities covered 19.8 percent of the age group 19-23 years in 1976-77. A high percentage of the enrollments (35.2) in that year occurred in Paris.[10] Student distribution among the faculties in three different years was as shown in Table 3.

Funding for public French universities comes primarily from the federal government through the Ministry of Education, although a small percentage is provided by tuition, research contracts, and other public subsidies. In 1975, 88.9 percent of the universities' budget was granted by

the Ministry, 8.9 percent came from tuitions and financed research, and two percent from other ministries and local governments.[11]

Table 3. Distribution of enrollments in the faculties of French universities, 1960-61, 1976-77, and 1983-84. (percentages)

Type of Schools	1960-61 (1)	1976-77 (1)	1983-84 (2)
Law & Economics	17.0	23.6	21.8
Letter & Soc Sci	31.2	30.8	34.6
Sciences	29.9	15.9	17.6
Med. & Dentistry	17.8	20.2	16.6
Pharmacy	4.1	4.1	4.0
U. Inst. Technol	---	5.4	6.0

Sources:
(1) Bienaymé, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education: France*. New York: International Council for Educational Development/Interbook, 1978. p. 6
(2) Neave, Guy. "Strategic Planning, Reform and Governance in French Higher Education." *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 10, No. 1, 1985. p. 10. Calculated from Table 1, p. 9

Scientific Research.

A very special feature in regard to scientific research was the French structure for such a task. As stated before, the research function practically constituted a distinct one even though it was accomplished within the framework of higher education. Scientific research was done predominantly in institutes specially created for such an end. Some institutes were placed within the universities, but still today most of the research is done outside the

universities. Within the faculties, the position of professor did not entail the task of doing investigation, although some instructors were researchers as well.

In 1939, the French government created a national agency, the *Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS),to provide financial support for scientific inquiry throughout the country. This agency established several research institutes and offered financial support for individual researchers working for any educational institution. Although the CNRS contributed significantly to the development of research in France, it also modelled the organization for investigation in a particular way producing a strong fragmentation of the research and a profound gap between teaching and inquiry. Van de Graaff synthesized the prevalent conditions before the 1968 reform, "Research was primarily the responsibility of central research institutions, whereas training in the traditional professions was given in their faculties, and various administrative and technical *cadres* (personnel) were recruited through the grandes écoles."[12]

By creating a different structure, the 1968 Orientation Law fostered a close relationship between research and teaching, although the traditional French centralization remained almost untouched, at least in the important matter of deciding national guidelines for scientific research. A report published in 1982 noted that

national agencies (chiefly the CNRS) do not share with the higher education institutions the process of policy making for research.[13] A brief overview of the funds directed to scientific investigation in 1984 reveals the weight of the different actors in that field.

Table 4. Funds for research, 1984.

Source	Millions of French francs	Percentages
On Campus research	500	2.8
Ministry of Industry and Research	8,400	46.4
CNRS and other organizations	7,400	40.9
Min. of Agriculture	200	1.1
Min. of Health	1,600	8.8
TOTAL	18,100	100.0%

Source:Bienaymé, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education: France*. New York: International Council for Educational Development/Interbook, 1978. p. 164, footnote #17

French Higher Education, a historical overview.

The French system of higher education has its earliest roots in the medieval University of Paris, which was founded in the twelfth century. The nineteenth century was the period, however, in which the French higher education acquired its more modern characteristics. Indeed, the basic structure of higher education in France was built in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and it lasted almost unchanged until 1968.

The first section is devoted to examine the most important historical moments of that period, in which

transcendent changes for universities and grandes écoles occurred. These moments, further explored in some detail, are:

a) 1793, when all French universities were closed by the revolutionary government;

b) 1806, when Napoleon Bonaparte decreed the foundation of the Imperial University aimed to direct the whole French education, and the reinforcing of the grandes écoles as key institutions;

c) the long process (between 1815 and 1850) by which the Ministry of Public Instruction took over the control of educational institutions once held by the Imperial University. This period was marked by the establishment of a bureaucratic control of education by the government, through rectors of academies;

d) the long process of re-creation of universities, from 1876 to 1896.

The closing of the traditional universities

By the time of the French Revolution, the universities had fallen from the pinnacle of leadership they had achieved during the Middle Ages. The twenty one universities existing in 1789 still cultivated the scholastic traditions, and were reluctant to teach the modern subjects such as geography, mathematics and science. Latin was the language of instruction and the university authorities

refused, in 1789, the use of French in lecturing and readings.

The predominant faculties were those of theology, law, and medicine. Their curriculum could hardly be more antiquated. The general criticism of the universities, wrote Barnard, was that they "...were hampered by tradition, inimical to progress and research, and out of touch with the current developments."[14] Because of these faults, not to mention their aristocratic character, The National Convention abolished all the universities in France in 1793. A few years later, Napoleon Bonaparte reorganized French education in ways familiar to the present, the most remarkable of which being the centralized control of institutions by the government.

The Imperial University and the new grandes écoles

In 1806, Napoleon established a state corporation to direct the whole of French education. The body was named *L'Université Imperiale*, and it covered from elementary parish schools through the highest level. The law of 1808 specified: "No school, no educational institution of any kind whatsoever, shall be permitted to be established outside the Imperial University, without the authorization of its chief. No one may open a school or teach publicly without being a member of the Imperial University and a graduate of one of its faculties."[15]

The Napoleonic University was headed by a 'Grand Master' and a Council. The University covered thirty-four "academies" corresponding to geographical regions; each one of these academic districts was presided over by an administrative officer called 'rector.' This concept of using a national agency to administer the educational system of an entire nation still marks strongly the present French higher education.

In order to temper the political power of the Church, Napoleon included some Churchmen in the Council but, simultaneously, he created a 'permanent section' within the Council, whose functions were to deal with day-to-day matters in education. Therefore, *L'Université Imperiale* was an almost independent corporation "possessing its capital, buildings, and finances," though the emperor held a complete control of its functioning.[16]

At the university level, five types of faculties were established: theology, law, medicine, arts, and science. Side by side with the faculties, a group of specialized schools was opened and/or consolidated, among them the *Ecole de l'Artillerie et du Génie* (1802), the *Ecole Normale Superieur* (1808), the *Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées* (1747), the *Ecole des Mines* (1783), and the *Ecole Polytechnique* (1794). Students graduated from the lycées were eligible to enter either a faculty or an école. It seems that with the Imperial University there began in France a dual structure -

universities on one side, grandes écoles on the other- that endured throughout the nineteenth century and still remains as a peculiar feature.

The Imperial University, the écoles, and the lycées were designed to suit the political and practical needs of an empire in expansion and, therefore, in continuous war. As to the political needs, Napoleon clearly attempted to reaffirm and preserve his empire. In a decree issued in 1809, he ordered that "All schools of the Imperial University will take as the basis for their instruction (i) the teaching of the Catholic religion, (II) fidelity to the Emperor, to the imperial monarchy which is entrusted with the happiness of the people, and to the Napoleonic dynasty which ensures the unity of France and all the liberal ideas proclaimed in the constitution, (iii) obedience to the regulations of the teaching body, the object of which is to secure uniformity of instruction and to train for the State citizens who are attached to their religion, their prince, their country and their family."[17]

As to the practical needs, they were mainly to prepare professionals for the different posts in the state's administration, and to furnish trained men for the war such as military engineers, artillery-men, surgeons, physicians, etc. As a result of their strategic value, the grandes écoles became the most important and dynamic sector of higher education in France. The Napoleonic regime raised the status

of the existing ecoles and created new ones. As Suleiman affirmed "...if they came to be central institutions in the formation of elites, this was in large part owing to Napoleon who recognized that the *écoles spéciales*... could be an important instrument for his reign."[18]

While the faculties kept the same organizational pattern and almost the same curricular contents until the last fifteen years of the nineteenth century, the specialized écoles evolved more freely, adjusting themselves to the professional needs expressed by the state. While the faculties tended to remain traditional and were reluctant to include new subjects to study, the government could easily establish specialized écoles to suit particular needs for trained professionals. Referring to the evolving pattern of higher education institutions Weisz noted that "Expansion generally followed the logic of functional specialization. Whenever the need for a new kind of specialist was felt, it was met by the establishment of another teaching institution."[19]

The reorganization of the French education under the Imperial University introduced a military discipline in some schools, especially in the lycées. The schools were subdivided in companies headed by sergeants and corporals. The students had to wear uniforms and school-life was strongly regimented.

A new authority in education, the Ministry of Public Instruction

The structure of the Imperial University, however, did not last, and by the middle of the nineteenth century, a newly created body, created and controlled by the Ministry of Public Instruction, the *Conseil de L'Instruction Publique,* seized much of the power once held by the University, mainly in the fields of elementary and secondary education. By this time, too, the faculties all over France had won a great deal of autonomy in their operation and management.

After the fall of Napoleon, the government of the Restoration eliminated the post of Grand Master, in 1815, and slowly, but firmly, the Ministry began to acquire more and more control over the schools in the basic education, and over the faculties in the higher level. In 1834 the government incorporated the budget of the University into the state's budget.

L'Université Imperiale not only was undermined by the government, it was also the focus of Catholic hostility. The *Université* was too independent for the centralist trends of Church and state. After 1830, successive governments sought to lessen the powers of the University through continuous limitations; *L'Université* became the target of the Ministers of Public Instruction since reducing the University's influence on secondary education would please

the Catholic opposition to the government and, at the same time, would increase the Ministry's control over education.[20]

In 1850, a law reorganized the *Université*, abolishing its permanent section and assigning one third of its key positions to clergymen. Its properties were taken over by *Conseil de L'Instruction Publique*. It lost completely its corporate autonomy. This action meant, also, a deprivation of the corporate autonomy somewhat enjoyed by the faculties. The powers of the *Université* over the individual faculties, were transferred to the Ministry, which exerted its authority through a body of inspectors and the group of rectors or heads of academic districts.[21] As a consequence, the professors were completely subject to the Minister's authority. He could, in fact, appoint or dismiss them without any consultation with the *Université*.

As a result of this process, the previously existing corporate power of the academics, crystalized in the Imperial University, was broken down and replaced by the authority of the centralized bureaucracy of the Ministry of Public Instruction. The faculties, whether in Paris or in other French cities and towns began to isolate from one another and to look individually for their particular interests. The faculties became the basic unit of teaching and they specialized in one of the five subjects already mentioned: law, science, medicine,arts, and theology. The specialized écoles, since they belonged to other ministries,

evolved steadily, though not without continuous efforts from Public Instruction ministers to control them.

Relations between faculties and grandes écoles

For many years the structure of the French higher education remained divided in two realms: the faculties on one side and the specialized écoles on the other. Neither the increase in enrollments nor the creation of new institutions challenged such division. The growing process did not convey the creation of a rational system of higher education. Specialized écoles were created at discontinuous periods and so were faculties. Weisz reported that "...from 1830 to 1870, the Ministry of Public Instruction established two new faculties of law, seven faculties of science, and ten faculties of letters. In the mid-1870s three new mixed faculties of medicine and pharmacy went into operation."[22]

The teaching conditions and organization in the faculties were not, however, accomplishing good results. Albert Dumont, who completed a inspection of several provincial faculties, wrote: "It is possible to do a great deal with what we have, the best reform is to profit from resources which are assured at this moment ...What is being wasted is frightful...I would like nothing better than the autonomy of universities [Actually he is referring to the faculties] on condition that the professors are changed. It is impossible to imagine the state of disorganization in the

large faculties which are simply not being administered. There is no longer responsibility or authority and the favors of the state only increase the evil."[23]

It was not until 1876 that many intellectuals along with the government could generate an initiative to reform the French faculties. One of the results of this effort brought about a project of law which intended the establishment of regional universities. A group of notable scholars designed a detailed project which was presented to the consideration of William Waddington, the then minister of Public Instruction, who also fostered the formulation of the project; needless to say the law was never passed. Another result of the movement was the constitution of a private society whose aim was to promote the creation of universities by the aggregation of the existing faculties. The group took the name of *Societé pour l'Etude des Question d'Enseignement Superieur* and its declared purpose, affirmed Weisz, was "...to establish links with and collect information about foreign institutions of higher education."[24]

Actually the legal initiative and the organization of the society were highlights of a large movement, among notable intellectuals, aiming to reform not only the status of the faculties, but also the independence of the specialized écoles. Suleiman affirmed that such a perspective was pervasive, "The need for universities and the importance

of having the universities absorb the grandes écoles was a prevalent point of view throughout the nineteenth century."[25]

The same author quoted the eloquent words of Ernest Renan, a great French intellectual who advocated the independence and greatness of the universities. Renan claimed that "There must be created in France five or six universities, independent of one another, independent of the towns where they are located, independent of the clergy. At the same time, we must abolish the specialized écoles, the *Ecole Polytechnique*, the *Ecole Normale*, etc. which are useless institutions when a good university system exists and which prevent universities from developing."[26]

The long, painful, re-creation of the universities

The twenty years running between 1876 and 1896 witnessed a broad intellectual -and often political- movement aiming to organize a university system in France. The period was rich in initiatives and projects coming from diverse parties. George Weisz made an accurate account of the several proposals formulated during that period, three of which are highlighted as the most influential. The first one was an official survey, in 1885, of the sixty-four faculties asking their opinion on the matter of uniting the existing faculties into universities, and the suggestions they would have regarding the universities' functioning.[27] The chief finding of the survey, *Enquêtes et documents relatifs a*

l'enseignement superieur, was that forty-four faculties were in favor of the constitution of universities while the other twenty faculties frankly rejected the proposal. The faculties were reluctant to aggregate themselves into universities because they feared losing their autonomy.

The second proposal was the outcome of a special Parisian commission headed by Ernest Lavisse. The recommendations from the Commission tried to balance the present interests, giving some power to each party: the professors would be named by the Minister upon faculty suggestions, the faculties would be allowed to design the teaching programs, and the universities, if created, would be given civil personality, "...without infringing on the autonomy of faculties...."[28] Finally, the third proponent was the group of faculties from Lyon, which claimed much more autonomy for the proposed universities and a treatment similar to the faculties of Paris for the provincial academics. The process of aggregating the individual faculties into universities was difficult to the extent that it implied the creation of a new level of authority that most likely would mean a limitation in the faculties' power. The proposals, however, hardly influenced the governmental policy regarding the amount of autonomy to be conceded to the universities and their faculties.

The official process of reform consisted basically of three legal steps: a) unification of sets of faculties

under governing bodies called *general council of faculties*, b) the empowerment of these councils by granting them civil personality, and c) re-naming those general councils as universities. Louis Liard, director of higher education in the Ministry of Education, has been recognized as the main intellectual author of this political and legal process of 're-creation' of the French universities in the late nineteenth century.

Under the new legal conditions the Ministry kept the right to authorize the creation of new chairs, and the opening of new courses. Two new governing bodies were created within the faculties, a *faculty council* in each one of the schools, composed only of the full professors, and a *faculty assembly* comprising all the school's professors. These two groups were entitled the right to control the teaching activities, although the real power rested exclusively with the senior professors. On the other side, the establishment of a faculty assembly was aimed to allow a mere formal participation of the junior faculty staff.

The election of dean in each faculty would not be, however, the academics' right. According to the decrees the deans were to be appointed by the Minister choosing from two lists of candidates, one provided by the respective faculty council (senior professors) and the other formulated by the general council of faculties. In the absence of conflict, noted Weisz, the Minister would name the person at the top of

the faculty council's list, but in the case of political conflict "...the compromise left the administration with a wide margin for maneuver."[29] Meanwhile, the appointment of professors, a key decision in the running of the faculties, remained in the hands of the Minister.

Another measure taken in 1885 was the aggregation of faculties, in each town having at least two faculties, into corporations headed by general councils of faculties. Each faculty had to send two representatives to the council, whose presidency was to be occupied by the chief educational officer of each region, the rector.[30] The need to balance the powers of the faculties and the central administration, along with the desires of the reformers, led the government to distribute some decision matters between the faculties and the general council of faculties. The Ministry of Public Instruction, however, wanted to hold most of the decision power. Therefore, the general council of faculties was made responsible for a few general functions: "...administer libraries, control financial appropriations for common services, replace the academic councils in examining the yearly faculty budgets, and coordinate the program of courses,"[31] in addition to some disciplinary jurisdiction over students and the right to propose candidates for chairs and deans.

Nevertheless, the existence of those general councils worked as the basic bodies which would become

universities. The second legal step, empowerment of the general councils, occurred in 1893 when they were awarded civil personality which allowed them to hold their own legal representation and, among other things, to ask for private financial support. The third legal reform took form in a bill introduced in 1896 by the then Minister of Public Instruction, Raymond Poincaré, "...allowing all sixteen groups of faculties to become universities." The change in their name did not imply more authority in the hands of the general councils of faculties -now university councils- nor more autonomy from the Ministry, except for two concessions: a) the new university councils, instead of the academic councils of each faculty, would assume disciplinary authority; and b) the universities would be allowed to create new special degrees, under supervision by the Ministry of Education yet exempted of the requirement of state examinations.[32]

A few final words have to be said as to the general motivation underlying the nineteenth century university reform movement. One might legitimately ask why should the individual faculties have been grouped and transformed into universities? The answer seems to be twofold, the first being certain intellectuals' concerns about the international position of France. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, France lacked educational institutions labeled as universities, though most of the grandes écoles and some

faculties were well known. Many scholars and politicians looked at the German universities and attributed to them a great role in the "national renaissance" of Germany after the Napoleonic wars. Weisz quoted Gabriel Monod who, in 1892, wrote that "...all of Europe has them [universities] and by not having them we lose a means of influencing international youth."[33]

The second part of the answer is that both the Ministry of Public Instruction and the professors were interested in reforming French higher education conditions. The former looked for extending its powers and the latter expected to raise their social and occupational status. Thus, authorities tried to model the universities in a way which allowed them more control over educational matters, while professors and faculties supported the reform movement as far as they could benefit from such reform. Besides, the mere existence of the grandes écoles strongly questioned the faculties' efficiency.

1896-1968, a period with no substantial changes

The mere agglomeration of faculties into universities, however, was not enough to foster real university life, activities, and attitudes among French scholars. After 1896, the faculties continued to devote themselves primarily to examinations, and teaching was not apparently the most important activity. Theodore Zeldin

affirmed that even when some courses were organized for students in order to prepare them for the *agrégation*, the professors did not emphasize academic discussion. "...(A) student would simply read an essay and the professor would say how it ought to be written in order to pass; there was no real discussion of the subject."[34] The *agrégation* was the examination that, once passed, permitted the graduates to teach in secondary schools.

The teaching contents in the faculties, therefore, focused mainly on subjects taught in those schools. So strong was this orientation in the faculties that Zeldin called them the "examining bodies for the secondary schools." And he added later, "The standard of examinations was still absurdly low and to obtain a degree did not require any physical attendance at the university."[35] That incredible laxity regarding attendance is confirmed by Grignon and Passeron, who reported that the 1959 reforms of the faculties included the establishment of "assiduity controls" for university students.

Conversely, the specialized écoles had always been more demanding. Admission to these schools was limited because of the strict entrance examinations. The teaching methods were more suitable for student learning than the scholastic lecturing in the faculties. The relationship between teachers and students was very often close and warm and, overall, "...the discussion class was given more

emphasis than the lecture, and private reading...replaced the memorizing of textbooks."[36]

Under these circumstances the universities in general, and the faculties in particular, became the target of tough criticism. By 1919, one of the most conspicuous groups, the *Compagnons de la Nouvelle Université*, demanded an entire reform of the university system. The group argued that many faculties "had never really lived except on paper," which was almost true in the case of some provincial faculties. This criticism was, however, more profound, as the group thought the concept of faculty itself was outdated, and that "the aim of making universities encyclopedic should be abandoned and instead the unit in higher education should be the specialized institute, which could combine several linked subjects."[37] The time in which these reforms were proposed was that of the World War I and, perhaps, the profound disarray of social and economic life caused by the armed conflict prevented any structural reform in the French higher education at that time.

The conditions of the faculties after the war must have been far from improved. Léon Berard, Minister of Education, planned to close several faculties and to create five national universities and eight regional ones. The aim of such a reform was to make the teaching of the faculties more closely related to practical needs. Zeldin noted that the Minister complained of an excessive theoretical teaching

and the low teaching load of the professors, as well as of the need to make an efficient use of the faculties' resources and budget. Berard's proposal, however, did not succeed because he was ousted from the Ministry after attempting to re-introduce Latin in French secondary education.

Not many changes were achieved within the universities before the 1968 reform but at least two structural changes in the system were introduced before 1968. The first one was the creation of the *Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS), in 1939; and the second, in 1966, the creation of the *Institutes Universitaires du Technologie* (IUTs). (see above the sections devoted to the IUTs and to scientific research)

Apparently, the actual status of the faculties remained unaltered until 1968. An exception might be the changes occurring within the faculties during the period 1959-1967. Before these reforms happened the universities seem to have become the bastions of traditionalism. Their faculties retained a great deal of autonomy which meant in their case lagging behind the advancement of knowledge and scientific research. Academics did not even stay current with changes in French culture. As Zeldin asserted, "The revival of the universities took place long after an active cultural life had already been established in France and had found different ground in which to grow. The intellectual elite, men of letters, the world of the salons, continued more or

less independent of the universities. The progress of knowledge took place largely outside them too."[38]

In 1959, the faculties of law, medicine, science, and arts underwent some academic reforms whose chief aims were to improve the quality of teaching and to adjust the programs to the needs of the labor market and economic development. In the faculty of law, for example, a new program, the *licence* in economics, was created. In medicine, the whole faculty life was involved in the recently created *Centres Hospitaliers Universitaires*. Teachers and students were obligated to participate in hospital life, therefore lending a thoroughly new orientation to the preparation of medical graduates. Later, in 1966, an apparently important change took place in the faculties of science and art. New diplomas were to be awarded at the end of the second year of studies: the *Diploma Universitaire d'Etudes Scientifiques* (DEUS) and the *Diploma Universitaire d'Etudes Litteraires* (DEUL).

In all these reforms the central government played the key role. Grignon and Passeron affirmed that in the case of science and arts, "...the decisions were prepared in comparative secrecy by negotiation between ministerial department and university pressure groups...."[39] And, regarding the transformations in medicine, the same authors asserted it was the result of the French government's will "...to make French medical research competitive at the

international level..."[40] rather than the medicine professors' perception of the need of reform. Once again the French faculties had to be pulled ahead to improve their qualifications.

The changes of this period, 1959-1967, however, did not seriously alter much the structural characteristics of higher education in France. As Grignon and Passeron put it in 1970, the reforms "...affect the first and second cycles of higher education without touching the strategic institutions which give functional meaning to the system, the Grandes Ecoles and agrêgation."[41] Indeed, the first reform that really changed the old and traditional features of the faculties was that expressed in the 1968 Orientation Law.

Centralism and governance in the French universities.

The French system of higher education has always been strongly determined by the national government, and such a powerful influence can be traced to the Napoleonic regulations and his peculiar project of a Imperial University. Later, in the last decade of the 19th century, another thrust of state influence took place, this time over the then dispersed faculties, to group them into universities. It was in part because of such enormous centralization that most universities developed only five typical faculties with a narrow set of careers. It was not

until the post-war period that some curriculum innovations, in the form of new fields of study and careers, appeared.

Centralization also fostered homogeneity. A broad range of decisions was made by government officers, and very often those decisions were given for all the system instead of for single institutions. "Teaching methods, examinations, and degree requirements were identical, and any changes or innovations had to be approved by the minister," and those decisions, "...whether major or minor are made in ministries of Paris or even at cabinet level."[42] This centralization has, at least, two aspects: first, the strong dependence all universities have on the French government and its bureaucracy; and second, the provincial universities' dependence on the model provided -and exalted- by the University of Paris. "The French universities," asserted Grignon & Passeron, "differ from each other only by the degree of conformity to a single model represented by the Paris faculties."[43] Thus centralization of decisions in the French government inhibited whatever potential would exist for innovation and diversity within universities and among teaching staff. In addition to this "administrative uniformity," the French universities suffered a sort of "emulation syndrome" by means of which we find a "...persistent tendency of every faculty to become a fully-fledged Faculty offering the whole range of degrees like the Sorbonne...[in Paris]."[44]

The 1968 and 1983 Reforms of Higher Education.

The reforms in 1968 and 1983 conducted by the French government intended to modify current practices by promulgating laws of general observance for the university sector of higher education. Specifically, these reforms are those introduced by the 1968 Orientation Law for Higher Education and the 1983 Orientation Law for Higher Education, also known as the Faure Act and the Savary Act, respectively. The Savary reform was a process of "normal policymaking," while the Faure reform falls in the category of "extraordinary policymaking" in the sense defined by Keeler.[45]

The two reforms contributed to modify some characteristics of French higher education. The 1968 reform, however, was a radical one in that it changed the very organizational base and government of French universities. The 1983 reform, on the other hand, may also be regarded as a radical reform since it faced an extraordinary opposition (even during its legislative process) and was, to some extent, rolled back in 1986.

"Too Little Too Late." The 1968 Loi d'Orientation de l'Enseignement Superieur.

It is not an exaggeration to say that before 1968 the French universities' structure had remained basically unchanged since 1896. With the exception of the establishment

of the National Engineering Schools (ENSI) and the *Institutes Universitaires de Technologie* (IUTs), no structural change was introduced in the French universities. This is not to affirm, however, that the contents of teaching did not change. Several institutes specifically devoted to scientific research had been established since the 1940s, and even some of them were placed within the universities. In addition, the other great sector of France's higher education, the *grandes écoles*, had demonstrated a dynamic response to the need of professionals in jobs developed by the economic and social changes in recent decades. As Alain Bienayme put it, the French higher education "...kept the same structure [and]...stayed fundamentally binary and monolithic. Binary because...*Grandes écoles*...and *universités*...have received different labels and obey different regulations. Monolithic because in every region of France...*the* university was cast in the same mould, with its set of five faculties."[46]

Indeed, before 1968 the French universities were far from the modern model of comprehensive institutions offering a wide range of programs, which has long ago generally prevailed in the world. French universities were, in the words of H.D. Lewis "...a collection of independent faculties which regulated their own internal affairs with little reference to each other or therefore to the university as a whole."[47] There had been practically no progress in the organization of the French universities since Louis Liard

gathered fourteen groups of faculties in 1885, and Raymond Poincaré gave them the name of universities in 1896.

The problem with such an organization was that French universities were managed by small groups of professors with the consent and the support of the French government. Thanks to the structure of faculties, a variety of powers was concentrated "...in the hands of the professors and the highest ranking members of staff of the various faculties."[48] There was no participation of students or administrative employees, nor even the low ranks of non-tenured teachers. Participation by lay members rarely happened, and it was limited to the university councils. The *conseil de faculté* (senior professors presided over by the dean) decided in matters of budget allocation and curriculum. The *faculté* assembly, (the gathering of all tenured teachers) an old-fashioned body, was designed to allow the junior faculty to give their opinions regarding teaching contents. The supreme governing body of each university was composed of the deans and two senior professors of each *faculté*, and occasionally some lay members. University councils were presided over by a representative of the Ministry of National Education, the rector of the academy; and the councils' decisions could only be executed after approval of the Minister.[49]

Contrasting with the stagnation in university organization, the arrival of students in French universities

increased enormously after the end of the World War II. "While from 1945 to 1961, a period of fifteen years, the number of students doubled; their number more than doubled in the six years between 1961 and 1967."[50] It meant an enrollment of 7.7% of the age group [18-23 years] in 1955, 25% in 1975 (Ambler:1988, p. 472), and 28% in 1984 (Bienayme: 1984, p. 153).

With exception of a few adjustments (like the opening of the IUTs), neither the government nor the academic community promoted major changes in university organization. In the words of Ambler, "Governments simply sought to meet the demand, believing that expansion would satisfy voters and also provide the [necessary] educated labor force...."[51] Thus, 1968 was the year in which the discomfort of students (concerns for future employment, inadequacies in university facilities) and the need for reform coincided to put in motion a social and political process of policy making.

Some authors (Cohen and Lewis) find an antecedent to the 1968 reform in two colloquia, celebrated in Caén, 1966 and in Amiens, March 1968, respectively. The two conferences focused their discussions on the several aspects of French university education that were in need of change. The Caén colloquium gathered mainly professors of sciences who focused their considerations on issues such as decentralization, autonomy, and participation. Lewis synthesized the issues at Caén in the following statement, "The faculty structure was

felt to be stifling and a more participatory democratic structure was demanded. Also desired was a more diversified system with interdisciplinary courses, autonomy from the Ministry of Education and the possibility of obtaining private investment.[52] The around five hundred educators attending the Amiens colloquium called for improvements in teacher training, innovations in teaching techniques, and psychological training in adolescent behavior.

This is not to say that the 1968 reform's contents were preconceived as early as 1966. Faure's reform was not the legal outcome of a trend or a long-lasting process of designing the reform. Rather it was a massive student protest and the threat it posed over social and political stability which "opened the window for reform." In addition, the 1968 reform enjoyed the thrust of the overwhelming electoral victory of De Gaulle. Then, the 1968 reform possessed the political advantages of a combination of the "urgency-mechanism" and an extraordinary mandate, in the sense defined by Keeler; the "urgency mechanism" works, in the midst of a crisis, by generating "...a sense of urgency predicated on the assumptions that already serious problems will be exacerbated by inaction."[53] A crisis Keeler characterized as "...a situation of large-scale public dissatisfaction or even fear stemming from wide-ranging economic problems and/or unusual degree of social unrest and/or threats to national security."[54] Or, in the words of Ambler, "A *crise d'université*

helped to produce a *crise de régime*, which momentarily weakened the resistance of conservative forces and made fundamental educational reform thinkable."[55] Nevertheless, the 1968 law also required the intelligence and the extraordinary political skills and ability of Edgar Faure.

From the several issues addressed by the 1968 law, only those regarding university government will be considered here: the organizational changes operated in the French universities' structure and the provisions for participation of students and junior faculty in the universities' governance. First, the traditional set of five faculties was decomposed and then re-integrated into *unités d'enseignement et de recherche* (UERs) attempting to break the academic and administrative closeness of the faculties. This reform intended to satisfy the demand for multidisciplinarity and, in so doing, to erode the bases of the senior professors' power within the universities. Second, a new system of representation of the different kinds of university staff and employees was set up as new governing boards were established. There was to be a university council and a council in each UER. The two types of councils were to be "In the interest of participation...composed of teachers, researchers, students, and nonteaching staff members." (Article 13), and "Representatives of the various categories...are periodically chosen by secret ballot in separate electoral colleges." (Article 14)[56] Thus, all

university members were given the right to participate in their institutions' policy making processes, although the number of teachers in the councils was to be "...at least equal to that of students...." (Article 13) to balance students' and professors' power.

Also radical was the 1968 provision for the French universities and UERs which determined their own statutes, their internal structures, and the nature of their connections with other university units (Article 11). Another important reform was the establishment of the post of university president to be occupied by a person elected by each university's council. This reform meant the substitution of the rectors of academy (the government officers holding regional representation of the Ministry of Education) as the supreme regional authorities of the universities.

What have been the accomplishments of the Faure reform? Different and contradictory assessments have intended to provide an answer.

By December 1968 nearly 600 new UERs had been formed and by April most UERs had elected their council representatives. The implementation process, however, was complex and uneasy. Many new UERs were simply the old faculties renamed while others, "...were forming on the basis of friendship and political affinities."[57] The first elections were conducted in an environment of great ideologization and, at least on the side of the students, 52% of them voted in

spite of the extreme Left's call to boycott the election of representatives to both the UERs and university councils.[58]

The achievements of the reform were uneven. The faculties of medicine and pharmacy "maintained their institutional integrity nearly everywhere," and "a dozen of the smaller provincial universities...emerged largely unchanged from the reorganization."[59] The academic communities of law and sciences were probably the most easily regrouped into UERs. Participation was broadened although with some problems: Premfors noted how the percentage of students voting in their electoral colleges decreased steadily after 1969 (52%) to 1970 (31.2%) and 1974 (25.2%).[60] Despite that low rate of student participation in elections (which says nothing of student representatives' intervention in policy making), "the style of university governance has changed dramatically since the pre-1968 era when only full professors...participated in policy making. Representatives of the vastly expanded ranks of junior faculty...now take their place on the university councils, often seriously challenging the dominance of *les mandarines*."[61]

In summary, the 1968 reform of Edgar Faure may not have achieved all that its author and supporters expected. There has been in French universities still a strong centralism and, therefore, dependence on Paris and on the Ministry of Education for the funds that are authorized by the central government, and most of teachers are still civil

servants. The late 60s popular saying that "too little was made too late," is inaccurate if not false. Certainly, Faure's proposal to include the elite *grandes écoles* under the 1968 law could not be achieved because of strong opposition from their graduates in the government, and sooner than later the provisions of the Law were subject to "conservative interpretation," and the central control began to resume over some aspects of university life, "...but no effort was made to repeal any basic part of the Law itself."[62]

1983, A Law for the établissements publics à caractère scientifique culturel et professionnel.

Almost two years after taking office, the Socialists began to circulate their proposal for reforming higher education. It was a very well designed proposal attempting to change radically the way higher education was being conducted and delivered. A commission was set up by the Alain Savary, Minister of Public Education, in 1981, under the leadership of Claude Jeantet, to prepare a report which was to be the basis for the reform. Participants and interest groups in education were consulted and their opinions taken into account in the design of the reform.

The economic and political circumstances surrounding the reform were harsh since the "honeymoon period" for Socialist reform was already over. "Devaluations, exchange controls, tax increases, income policies, price increases for public services and new budgetary stringency

were introduced [in 1983] to cut inflation, lower French purchasing power and correct the massive trade imbalance."[63] The new circumstances generated by these measures "...inhibited policy initiative in education, but less severely than in other areas of social policy,"[64] allowing the Socialist government some room for maneuvering to introduce reforms in the field of education.

The proposals were more ambitious than those of the 1968 reform and they appeared as not being affected by the "*Socialist rigueur*" of the moment. The Savary reform's aims were those of making higher education more responsive to the demands for new jobs in the economy, of pushing further the autonomy of the sector, and the modernization of teaching. Specifically, the Law sought a) to improve university organization introducing new government bodies; b) to foster participation by making some changes in elections; c) to introduce curricular changes and some measures to select students before entering the second cycle, and some other "minor" reforms such as to abolish the *Doctorat d'Etat* and to place the *Centre Nationale pour la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS) under the authority of the Ministry of Industry and Research.

The 1983 Law was so ambitious that it attempted to direct the reform to the entire French higher education, including the "untouchable" *grandes écoles*, under the broad

heading of *établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel*.

One aspect of the proposal addressed the structure of the governing bodies. The former university councils were replaced by three bodies: a *Conseil d'Administration* a *Conseil Scientifique*, and a *Conseil des Etudes et de la vie Universitaire*. In addition, each university had to draw up new statutes and elect a new president. The first *Conseil*'s main functions were to decide on the university budget, to distribute the posts among the UERs and, of great importance, to approve the contracts linking universities with industry and business in general. The *Conseil Scientifique* was aimed to set "the major guidelines for research policy at the level of the individual establishment,"[65] while the third *Conseil* was devoted basically to broaden the participation of lay members and, significantly, it was given "powers of initiative in the area of curriculum development...an important step towards strengthening institutional initiative."[66]

The new councils had, at least, two underlying objectives in addition to those formally stated: first, to provide an institutional framework for rapid responsiveness to local and regional demands; second, to improve participation of university communities (students and junior faculty, overall) and lay members in the urgent need of innovation. "...The new councils were seen as a boost for the

moribund principles of participation so ardently desired in 1968. Student representation was improved and non-university members were to be elected [20-30% of lay members] to all councils, the latter in an attempt to encourage universities to be more outward looking."[67] Two issues, however, prevailed in the criticism raised by the Law, the abolition of student quorum (a measure to limit the number of student representatives, on the basis of percentage of votes from the entire student population) in the election of student representatives, and the alleged under-representation of the senior staff compared with that of the junior teachers (representatives of the full professors were to be elected in a single electoral college which included the other categories of teaching staff and other university employees).[68] "This combination of voting regulations," judged Bienayme, "gave plenty of opportunity for labour unions, mainly from the left wing, to capture university governance through teachers' unions, worker unions and student political associations. Additionally this will give party politics the last word when conflicts arise."[69]

Since a trend had been evolving in the direction of increasing the number of assistants in the teaching body, full professors and *maitres des conferences* felt their decision making power was being overcome. This led to an extraordinary opposition from the "established scholars," one of them complaining that "...the whole law is inspired by the

desire to diminish their [senior professors] numerical weight in the governing boards."[70] In the end, the Constitutional Council ruled against the Savary Law's provision of a single electoral college for the election of faculty representatives "...on the grounds that it denied full professors the right to choose their own representatives."[71]

In the field of student admission, the Savary reform attempted to introduce some selection requirements for students entering the second cycle. However, the Law, in its article 12, established both a principle and its correlative exception, "...the provisions relating to the placing of students in institutions and on courses precludes any selection... However, selection may be operated according to procedures fixed by the Ministry of Education for entry to..." and then this text was followed by a list mentioning the *classes preparatoires*, the *grandes écoles* and the IUTs.[72] If the curricular changes appeared to be reasonable (yet the students of medicine and some professional of the field opposed the changes in the first cycle), the sole possibility of restricting entrance to the second cycle provoked a protest that filled once again the Parisian streets.

In general terms, the Savary curricular proposals aimed to generate a more efficient university education. Many vocational programs were initiated, including a new degree, the *Diploma d'Etudes Universitaires Scientifiques et Technologiques (DEUST)*, equivalent to the *Diplome d'Etudes*

Universitaires Genéralés (DEUG). Another of the proposals under the trend to professionalization was the establishment of new university units called *unités de formation et recherche* (UFRs). In its first ambitious version the Law even proposed that preparatory classes for entering to the *grandes écoles* could be taught by the universities.

The 1983 *Loi d'Orientation* faced strong opposition from the beginning of the legislative process. The Law was neither fully backed by the members of the government nor had it been set in a situation of urgent need of reform. Perhaps the first big defeat of the Law occurred in the National Assembly where more than two thousand amendments were proposed by the opposition.[73] In a typical intrastate conflict the *grandes écoles* refused to be included in the reform, "Ministries other than education which supervised grandes écoles rallied to the defense of their clients."[74] The Socialists had adopted, in 1972, the Communists' position that the *grandes écoles* were "fundamentally undemocratic" and should, therefore, be integrated with the universities under the norms governing the latter. However, "When the principle was interpreted to require diminution of the autonomy of the grandes écoles, the loyalties of graduates and the competing interests of ministries proved stronger than campaign promises."[75]

In the end the Savary Law passed and went into implementation. Its outcomes, however, fell short of both the

needs for university modernization and the reformers' expectations.

1968 and 1983, Towards a Conclusion

In analyzing the recent government processes of educational policy-making in France, Ambler found three different forms of state action: a) the simple response to demand/expansion of the system; b) "structural reform in time of crisis," and c) the "incremental pursuit of long-term goals such as democratization and modernization by a series of laws, ordinances, decrees, and circulars."[76]

In terms of Ambler's classification, the Faure Law was a "structural reform in time of crisis," while the Savary proposal may be regarded as a piece of incremental policy-innovation. In one sense the 1968 reform was more radical, for it changed the old traditional university structure and opened the new governing bodies to students' participation. Many aspects of French university education, however, remained almost untouched: the unrestricted access to all *baccalaureat* holders, the nature of the relationships between universities and industry and business, the traditional lack of communication -and often rivalry- with the *grandes écoles*, and the opening of new academic programs, among others.

The Savary reform, although viewed as incremental - with respect to that of 1968 - proved to be more radical than its precedent of 1968. The Savary proposal covered more areas

such as more student participation in university governance, a curricular change in the contents of the first cycle, a restriction in admissions to the second cycle, and the opening of new vocational programs. Altogether, it meant not only an organizational change but also a new form of relationship among university actors and between the universities and several social groups. Among the more conflictive issues were those of the overhaul of the first cycle and the possibility of introducing selectivity in university education.

As to the temporal dimension of the reforms, it should be said that the Faure reform, if not fully implemented immediately, was never rolled back. Quite contrary, the new structure of French universities has been the foundation upon which many further incremental reforms have been accomplished. On the other side, the Savary reform even though it achieved some success in modifying the French universities was repealed in 1986 under the new balance of political forces in the national stage. Since some universities had already undergone some change (new statutes and new presidents) "...the repeal of the Savary law and the withdrawal of the Devaquet law that was supposed to replace it in fact left a vacuum in the organization of more than half the French universities."[77]

Both reforms, despite being directed to higher education, were fundamentally different and also different

were the political circumstances surrounding them. The Faure reform was catalyzed by, and launched as a response to, the student movement and the recognition of the deteriorated conditions of French higher education (or, at least, of the universities). The Savary reform was, on the other hand, an attempt to rationalize the university sector, to reduce the public share of the universities' budget, and to make them more efficient and responsive to economic needs of the moment: the domestic Socialist *relance* and the process of integration with the European Economic Community.

The 1983 reform was largely thought out and the constituents broadly consulted before drawing up the law, while the 1968 reform was rushingly drafted in conditions of political instability, but with strong support from De Gaulle. "Without the crisis, and without President De Gaulle's firm support it is unlikely that the conservative parties in power would have agreed to any form of university election which would allow leftist unions supported by students and junior faculty to control university councils and elect university presidents."[78]

By addressing the main source of problems in the French universities - an obsolete structure which blocked almost any innovation - the Faure reform was able to radically change some patterns of university development. The Faure reform set, at least, a foundation in which incremental change would be possible. The Savary reform, to the contrary,

because it addressed a vast range of issues of French higher education could not survive the obstacles within the government, nor overcome all the difficulties of implementation.

An assessment in the words of a French scholar (an insider of the policy field, we could say) regarded the 1968 reform as "...a genuine achievement because, after all, it tried to respond to the dissatisfactions of hundreds of thousands of students. It was oriented to youth interest...[while] the 1983 initiative, in spite of its appearances, is inspired by the vested interests of unionized and highly politicized junior faculties. It cannot claim the same sympathy."[79] The issue, however, is not a matter of sympathy, but how successful policy making occurs. In France, because of its centralized political and administrative system, "excessive" politicization of the issues happens very often. The reformers, seeking rapid and homogeneous change have to work out reforms by juridical means, and more often than desirable "...the legislative process becomes an obstacle to reform by polarizing opinion both within and without the university..."[80] But the problem of legislation resides more, in this case, in the centralized features of the French system than in the legislative process in itself (always politicized, by definition). It could be said of the fate of the French universities the words that Christian Fouchet, former minister of education, said to Faure in 1968,

"Your reform is proclaimed to be liberal and audacious, I think it is quite the contrary. It is authoritarian. I am a partisan of autonomy...But where is the autonomy that you propose? The state pays, the professors have their statute, the universities do not compete, and the diplomas are uniform."[81]

Notes to Chapter I Structure and Governance of French Universities. The 1968 and the 1983 Reforms.

[1] Knowles, Asa. *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978. Vol. 4, p. 1775

[2] Van de Graaff, John H. and Dorotea Furth. "France" in *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education.* John H. Van de Graaff et. al. New York: Praeger, 1978. p.50-51

[3] Knowles, Asa. op. cit. p. 1776

[4] Neave, Guy. "Strategic Planning, Reform and Governance in French Higher Education." *Studies in Higher Education.* Vol. 10, No. 1, 1985. p. 10

[5] Ibidem

[6] Ibid. p. 15-16

[7] Van de Graaff, John H. "The Politics of Innovation in French Higher Education: The University Institutes of Technology." *Higher Education.* Vol. 5, 1976. p. 195

[8] Ibidem.

[9] Ibidem

[10] Bienaymé, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education*: France. New York: International Council for Educational Development - Interbook, 1978. p. 7

[11] Bienaymé, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education* Op. Cit. p.11, Table 8

[12] Van de Graaff, John H. and Dorotea Furth, op. cit. p. 50

[13] Lapointe, Serge. "Autonomy and Management of Institutions of Higher Education in France." *Institutional Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education.* Vol. 6, No. 3. p. 242

[14] Barnard, H. C. *Education and the French Revolution.* Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1969. p. 12

[15] Barnard, H. C. *Education and the French Revolution* Op. Cit. p. 217

[16] Weisz, George._*The Emergence of Modern Universities in France, 1863-1914.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983. p. 32

[17] Barnard, H. C. *Education and the French Revolution* Op. Cit. p. 218

[18] Suleiman, Ezra N. *Elites in French Society: The Politics of Survival.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978. p. 34-35

[19] Weisz, George. Op. Cit. p. 20-21

[20] Ibid. p. 32-33

[21] Ibid. p. 34-35

[22] Ibid. p. 21

[23] Quoted by Weisz, George. Op. Cit. p. 142-3

[24] Ibid. p. 66 Weisz added that the *Societé* was successful "...in mobilizing provincial academics behind the reform movement. The formation of local societies was encouraged and first a *Bulletin* and then the *Revue internationale de l'enseignement* were established to stimulate communication and debate about higher education. "

[25] Suleiman, Ezra N. Op. Cit. p. 51

[26] Renan, Ernest. *La Réforme Intellectuelle et Morale*. Paris: Michel Levy, 1871. Quoted by Ezra N. Suleiman, op. cit. p. 51

[27] Weisz, George. Op. Cit. p. 135 The chapter four, "The Creation of the French Universities," is entirely devoted to analyze the different proposals and the sinuous process of arriving to the reform.

[28] Ibid. p. 151

[29] Weisz, George. Op. Cit. p. 146

[30] It must be recalled here that the French academies are territorial and administrative circumscriptions, and that the government officer who rules the academies is called rector.

[31] Weisz, George. Op. Cit. p. 146

[32] Ibid. p. 161

[33] Ibid. p. 156

[34] Zeldin, Theodore. "Higher Education in France, 1845-1945." *Journal of Contemporary History*. Vol. II, No. 3 (Jul) 1967. p. 61

[35] Ibid. p. 61

[36] Ibid. p. 70 Zeldin referred specifically to the *Ecole Normale* but the characteristics here mentioned can easily be generalized to the rest of the écoles if we recall the regimented life in the *lycées* under the Napoleonic rule.

[37] Ibid. p. 60

[38] Zeldin, op. cit. p. 69

[39] Grignon, C. and Passeron, J. C. *Case Studies on Innovation in Higher Education. French experience before 1968.* Paris: OECD, 1970. p. 31

[40] Ibidem

[41] Ibid. p. 32

[42] Knowles, Asa. Op. cit. p. 1773; and Van de Graaff, John H. & Dorotea Furth (1978) p. 52

[43] Grignon C. and Passeron, J. C. Op. cit. p. 97

[44] Ibid. p. 98

[45] Keeler, John T.S. "Opening the window for Reform: Mandates, Crises and Extraordinary Policymaking." Paper presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the American Political Association. August 30-September 2. p. 2

[46] Bienayme, Alain. "The New Reform in French Higher Education." *European Journal of Education*. Vol 19, No. 2, 1984. p. 153

[47] Lewis, H.D. *The French Education System*. London: Croom Helm, 1985. p. 120

[48] Ibidem.

[49] Cohen, Habiba S. *Elusive Reform: The French Universities, 1968-1978*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1978. p. 54-55

[50] Ibid. p. 11

[51] Ambler, John S. "French Education and the Limits of Autonomy." *Western Political Quarterly*. Vol. 41, No. 3, (Sept. 1988) p. 472

[52] Lewis, H.D. op. cit. p. 121

[53] Keeler, John T.S. op. cit. p. 10-13

[54] Ibidem.

[55] Ambler, John S. "The Politics of French University Reform: Ten Years after May." *Contemporary French Civilization*. Fall 1980, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 153

[56] Law No. 68-978 of November 12, 1968 for the Orientation of Higher Education. In Bienayme, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education: France*. International Council for Educational Development, 1978.

[57] Premfors, Rune. "Institutional Governance in Higher Education: Policy Implementation in France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom." *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*. Vol. 4, No. 1, March 1980. p. 4

[58] Premfors, Rune. "Institutional Governance..." Op. Cit. p. 6

[59] Van de Graaff, John and Dorotea Furth. "France." In *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. John Van de Graaff et al. New York: Praeger, 1978. p. 58.

[60] Premfors, Rune. (1980). op. cit. p. 5

[61] Ambler, John. (1980) op. cit p. 15

[62] Premfors, Rune (1980). op. cit. p. 5

[63] Ross, George. "From one Left to Another. *Le Social* in Mitterrand's France." In *The Mitterrand Experiment*. George Ross, Stanley Hoffman and Sylvia Malzacher Eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. p.204

[64] Ambler, John S. "Constraints on Policy Innovation in Education. Thatcher's Britain and Mitterrand's France." *Comparative Politics*. Vol. 20, No. 1 October 1987, p.91

[65] Neave, Guy. "Strategic Planning, Reform and Governance in French Higher Education." *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 10, No. 1, 1985. p. 13

[66] Ibid. p. 14

[67] Lewis, H.D. Op. cit. p. 135

[68] Bienayme, Alain. (1984). Op. Cit. p. 162

[69] Ibidem

[70] Ibid. p. 159

[71] Ambler, John S. (1987) op. cit. p. 94

[72] Lewis, H.D. op. cit. p. 128

[73] Neave, Guy. (1985) Op. Cit. p. 8

[74] Ambler, John S. (1988) op. cit. p. 478

[75] Ibid. p. 478

[76] Ibid. p. 473

[77] Lamoure Rontopolou, Jeanne and Jean Lamoure. "French University Education: a brief overview, 1984-1987." *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 23, Nos. 1/2, p. 39

[78] Ambler, John S. (1988). op. cit. p. 473

[79] Bienayme, Alain. (1984). op. cit. p. 151

[80] Neave, Guy. "On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986-1987." *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 23, Nos. 1-2, p. 13

[81] Quoted by Cohen, Habiba S. (1978). op. cit. p. 77

Chapter II.- Some Factors Influencing the Evolution of Governance in American Universities.

History of American Higher Education, a brief overview

The American system of higher education began with the colonial colleges created beginning in the seventeenth century. The most characteristic feature of governance in American colleges and universities, namely non-professorial governing boards, evolved from Puritan patterns developed by Calvin and his followers in Europe and appeared in all nine of the colleges established prior to 1776. The figure of the college president, while present from the beginning, did not have the authority during this time held by the board. In a summary of the colonial period, Cowley and Williams (1991) commented that the colonial colleges "served their times brilliantly," and that they laid a solid foundation upon which was possible the development of stronger institutions in the years that followed.

The "period of exploration" which followed the American revolution witnessed experimentation and the opening of many new institutions. In 1819, Jefferson obtained a charter for the University of Virginia as an institution entirely dependent of the state, in which he introduced a fixed curriculum in each one of its seven academic departments. Inspired by the ideas of Jefferson, many states gave education an important role in the building of the newly created nation. College education for blacks and women also appeared for the first time during this period with the

establishment of colleges and normal schools (Oberlin, Mount Holyoke, Wilberforce, etc.). The contents of teaching in the colleges were broadly questioned and discussed; the teaching of science and the "mechanical arts" on one side and of the classical subjects on the other became the opposites in the discussion. Here was a time for the experimentation with elective courses in Harvard under the guidance of George Ticknor who based his conception in the German principle of *Lernfreiheit* (freedom of study),[1] Many new institutions of a different type were established during this period: the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and, in 1861, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The two major events of the period took place, however, in 1819 and 1862. The U.S. Supreme Court's resolution against the intervention of the state of New Hampshire in the governance of Dartmouth College (a move inspired in part by Jefferson's efforts in Virginia), established a formidable legal foundation on behalf of the colleges' autonomy and self-government. The Dartmouth College case contributed to the founding of hundreds of denominational colleges throughout the United States. According to Trow, "Marshall's decision had the practical effect of safeguarding the founding and proliferation of privately controlled colleges...[because the founders knew that once they]...obtained a state charter they were secure

in the future control of the institution."[2] In 1862 the basis for the creation of Land Grant colleges was laid. Called by some the Land Grant College Act and by others the Morrill Act, this Act donated public lands "...(T)o the Several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts." The new colleges were created to provide low-cost education for the common people and to offer educational options other than religious and classical. An innovative feature of the new colleges was that even though they emphasized the teaching of technical subjects, they could as well develop academic programs in "other scientific and classical studies." This innovation was very important to the extent that it led American educators away from the European custom of organizing separate institutions for "academic" and "technical" education. Over time it became a distinctive characteristic of American higher education.

The "period of diversification" following the American Civil War is known as the period of the rise of the new American university. Several foreign elements, mainly from Germany, were adapted to build a new type of institution. Cowley and Williams counted among the changes the lecture system (which replaced the traditional system of recitation), laboratory instruction, the seminar, the elective principle, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the term paper, and new methods of combining instruction and

research.[3] The period produced new ideas, proposals, and projects that transformed American colleges. Power passed from the boards to presidents, with outstanding academic leaders such as Daniel Coit Gilman, William Rainey Harper, and Charles W. Eliot developing new forms of organization and standards. The main legacy from those years is the comprehensive university, in many ways created by Eliot at Harvard, encompassing undergraduate as well as graduate education, scientific research, and the teaching of professions.

College education for blacks improved in the last quarter of the nineteenth century; Tuskegee Institute was opened in Alabama, as did the Rochester Atheneum in New York. In addition, just after the Civil War, many colleges were founded to offer educational opportunities to the black population, among them Howard University, Fisk University, Atlanta University, Morehouse, Talladega, and others.[4] Many normal schools began to be transformed by some states into two-year colleges. All these efforts led to new kinds of institutions in the United States, structural changes which "...(H)ad major impact upon the nation in the twentieth century and which account for the diverse nature of American higher education today."[5]

The twentieth century has seen a massive expansion of the system of higher education. The proportion of students receiving college education has increased dramatically in

this century: from 4% of the age-group 18-21 years in 1900 to 15% in 1940, and 32% in 1985. Many Land Grant colleges evolved to state universities, and some became multi-campus universities; many normal schools expanded into four-year teachers colleges, and later into universities. Meanwhile the junior college spread all over the United States. The federal response to the returning veterans from the Second World War contributed mightily to enrollment growth. Meanwhile state and federal governments increased their involvement in higher education in ways that are analyzed in later sections.

The Main Sectors of American Higher Education

American universities are more unconventionally classified than their counterparts in other countries. A reason for that is the great differentiation of post-secondary institutions; while other countries do not emphasize academic differentiation as the main subject for classification. So far the most common criteria for classification of post-secondary education are the levels of education it offers. American higher education is far more diversified than in other countries as is reflected in the Carnegie classification of higher education. This classification separates post-secondary educational institutions into ten basic groups: Research Universities (I and II); Doctorate-Granting universities (I and II);

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges (I and II); Liberal Arts Colleges (I and II); Two-Year Community, Junior, and Technical College; and Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions.

Table 5. Number of Institutions of Higher Education in the United States of America, 1970 and 1987

Type of Institution	1970 Total	1987 Total	1970 % Public	1987 % Public
Research Universities and Doctorate Granting Institutions	173	213	62.9	63.0
Comprehensive Univ. & Colleges	456	595	55.6	67.8
Liberal Arts Colleges	721	572	5.6	4.4
Two Year Institutions	1,063	1,367	72.1	76.0
Specialized Institutions	424	642	10.3	15.1
Total	2,837	3,389	45.7	46.6

Source:The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987. p. 3 and 5.

The subdivision into two categories (I and II) is normally made on the basis of size of institutions and/or number of degrees awarded by them, as well as the "comprehensiveness of their missions"[6] The last category, "Professional Schools and other Specialized Institutions," embodies theological seminaries, medical schools, schools of law, of engineering and technology, of business and

management, of art, music, and design, teachers colleges, and corporate sponsored institutions. All these types of institutions may be subdivided, of course, between public and private institutions. In addition to this complex picture, it should be noted the high degree of diversity according to the size of the institutions; there are several multicampus state-wide systems of higher education coexisting with small colleges. Table 5 shows some changes in the number of institutions of higher education in the United States between 1970 and 1987, and the proportion of public colleges in the total.

A very distinctive fact in the period shown in the table is the small proportion of public Liberal Arts colleges and their decline a time when all other categories grew in number. Doctorate-granting institutions and Comprehensive Universities and Colleges have steadily grown in numbers, while the Two-Year colleges have increased by more than three-hundred in the seventeen-year period. The overall picture shows a surprisingly steady balance of colleges publicly and privately funded (45.7% in 1970 and 46.6% in 1987 of public institutions). Some of the changes in the number of institutions, however, reflect not the creating or closing of colleges, but the shifts of institutions among the different categories. The shifts that happened between 1976 and 1987 provide an example of this movement; in that period,

new institutions accounted for fifty-two percent of the total change.[7]

Table 6. Enrollments in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States of America, 1970 and 1987. (Thousand of Students)

Type of Institution	1970 Total	1987 Total	1970 %public	1987 %public
Research Universities and Doctorate-Granting Institutions	2,674	3,429	75.8	77.4
Comprehensive Univ. & Colleg	2,519	3,303	78.6	72.0
Liberal Arts Colleges	690	584	6.3	7.5
Two-Year Institutions	2,347	4,518	94.3	94.1
Specialized Institutions	290	467	36.5	28.1
Total	8,520	12,301	74.8%	76.9%

Source:The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987. p. 3 and 5.

Concerning enrollments, however, most of the student population is found in the public institutions, (see the table below) with no major changes between 1970 and 1987 (74.8% and 76.9% respectively). The overall growth of the system has been impressive, almost four million students in the seventeen-year period. The decline in number of students attending liberal arts colleges (which are predominantly private) should be noted, also the enormous increase in

student population at two-year colleges, which itself accounts for more than fifty seven percent of the growth in the enrollments of American higher education from 1970 to 1987.

It should be noted that the distinction between public and private institutions in the United States is not as clear-cut as it is in France and Mexico; at least in regard to their sources of funding. Private colleges receive public funds for research, while public universities receive significant donations for research and other activities from corporations and business in general. Students in public and private institutions can be awarded loans and grants, either from state and federal government or from the private sector. Carol Stocking noted that about thirty percent of private donations went to public universities in 1982.[8]

Analysis of the numbers and cohorts of high school students led, in 1979, to predictions of a decline in college enrollments. Instead, the enrollments continued growing as a consequence of changes in the type of population seeking college education. Martin Trow pointed out how, indeed, the number of high school graduates declined between 1979 and 1984, but the consequence was not a reduction in students entering universities. He noted three significant changes that have been affecting American higher education: a) a steady growth, beginning in the seventies, in the number of older students enrolling in universities; b) a trend among

the student population to enroll on a part-time basis; and c) the increasing enrollment of women and minorities.[9]

American Higher Education and the Government

At the turn of the century, some state governments felt the need to introduce some kind of control and coordination among universities since they were competing for resources as well as for students. An interesting part of this process is that one of the outcomes was "...The rise of a new generation of state coordinating boards for higher education...."[10] According to this conception, a third party entity, mediating among state higher education institutions, would permit decisions based on a "nonpartisan spirit." The enormous growth of higher education after the Second World War fostered the further appearance and consolidation of state-level coordinating bodies. Their main goal was to provide state legislatures and governors with objective information and analysis for making decisions regarding new campuses, their size and location, the programs to be initiated, and the population to be served.[11]

The American system of higher education received an extraordinary impulse from the federal government after the Second World War. Before the forties, the main sources of economic support for colleges and universities were the student tuitions and funds provided by state governments. In order to avoid unemployment and social unrest among the large

number of returning veterans, President Roosevelt issued in 1944 the Servicemen's Readjustement Act. This law, later labeled as the G.I. Bill, entitled every veteran to the right to attend college for a period in proportion with his/her length of service. For those returning veterans who could not find a job within their first year, the G.I. Bill provided a weekly payment of twenty dollars. If a veteran was attending college then he/she was entitled to monthly allowances of fifty dollars (and more in the case of married veterans). In addition the government paid for the tuition, books, and other supplies. It is estimated that 2,232,000 attended college thanks to the Second World War G.I. Bill.[12] This Bill not only changed the nature of the relationship between colleges and federal government, it also meant a change in the conception of college education and who should attain it. University education would no longer be a privilege for a small sector of the population, but a right for every citizen.

Contributing to this trend was the 1947 Truman Commission report. This report encouraged more people to seek a college education and pointed to how this goal could be accomplished. It recommended that qualified individuals have their way open to higher education and that no one should be denied that education for reasons of cost. Under the title of "Higher Education for American Democracy," the document recommended the opening of more colleges and the provision of

scholarships to widen opportunities for access. Perhaps it was in the community colleges where the Truman report had its greatest impact; state governments and local authorities were called upon to support the existing junior colleges and opening new ones to serve the "full educational needs" of their surrounding communities.[13] The main outcome of this governmental effort was to be, within a few years, an entirely new sector of American higher education: the community colleges. By 1970, this sector had grown to more than one thousand institutions, most of them (3/4) publicly funded.[14]

A new impulse to all American education was launched in 1958, mainly as a consequence of governmental action against what was seen as a threat, the Soviet technological supremacy demonstrated in the success of putting in orbit the first artificial space satellite. As it relates to higher education, two years before, in 1956, President Eisenhower appointed a committee to analyze the trends and forecast the development of higher education. The report predicted an enormous increase in college enrollments as a consequence of the postwar births. The Soviet sputnik was the detonator of governmental action developed on the basis of the Eisenhower report. The legal outcome, the National Defense Education Act, allowed the federal government to allocate funds to: a) student loans, b) fellowships for graduate study, c) special support for the

areas of science, mathematics, foreign languages, and health; and d) on-campus scientific research.[15]

The sixties were years specially fruitful for American higher education. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson supported in many ways its development, new facilities, more student loans, improvement of libraries, and, overall, more graduate study and research. Salient in this decade was the Higher Education Act of 1965 which provided support for undergraduate students and which symbolized President Johnson's desire for more federal involvement in higher education. A few numbers show the dramatic changes of the sixties: five million new students, five hundred new campuses, 250,000 new faculty jobs, and a commitment from state governments to higher education indirectly measured by the increase of state appropriations for higher education, from 1.37 billion dollars in 1960 to 5.79 billion in 1970.[16] Two more remarkable events took place in the sixties: the creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities and for the Arts, and the foundation of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; the former expanded scholarship in the humanities and promoted developments in the arts, whereas the latter allowed the elaboration of an enormous body of research about the characteristics, trends, and problems of American higher education. Nowadays, the state and federal governments provide a major source of support for college education. The states tend to fund the universities'

operating expenses, while the federal agencies provide student aid, resources for research, and funds for vocational and adult education. The major federal agencies supporting university-based research are: the Departments of Health and Human Services, Defense, Agriculture, Energy, and the National Science Foundation.[17]

Special Features of American Higher Education

American universities and colleges are, certainly, very different from the traditional European types of universities, at least in regard with their forms of governance. Institutional governing boards, a great deal of autonomy from the state, and, in the overall system, the absence of a central government authority for higher education are, all of them, special features of American colleges and universities.

The governing board has been the traditional means by which all universities, public and private, are governed. Governing boards have been an essential part of American higher education since the foundation of the colonial colleges. This form of government has its roots in the council that directed the *Academie de Geneva*, an institution created by John Calvin around 1559 to teach arts, theology, and law. That council, named the Consistory, was integrated by clergymen and civil authorities, with a majority of members from the latter. Such a form of government soon

dominated in the areas under tne influence of Calvin and it "...(H)elped to shape the government of Harvard, and William and Mary, the first American colleges."[18] The principle underlying the existence of a group of lay persons with delegated power to govern a college is that these people represent the "interest of the public." The major decisions regarding the fate of the colleges are therefore not made by the government nor by the scholars, but by a group of trustees representing the whole society in conducting the affairs of the institutions. Lay boards can warrant the universities as being "...(R)esponsive to the larger society, and to its markets for students and graduates, rather than to the state or professional guilds."[19]

Public institutions usually have trustees appointed by state governors, while private universities tend to have the so-called self-perpetuating boards. In general terms, the governing board's main task is to supervise the running of an institution and to entrust "...(T)he conduct of administration to the administrative officers, the president and the deans, and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty."[20] The statement on university governance made by the American Association of University Professors specifies that in general a governing board shall act on behalf of the institution's president, faculty, or the students body. The protection of individuals or groups, however, is "...(I)n

fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution."[21]

The success of governing boards in supervising university development, among other things, has helped to prevent strong control from state or federal government over American higher education. Even state-wide systems of higher education are not controlled directly by the government but by a state-wide board of trustees or regents. In recent years, however, state governments have developed coordinating agencies which tend to function as buffers between institutions and governors and legislatures. These agencies often provide state authorities with long-range state-wide plans for higher education. Nevertheless the governance and policy making of many institutions rest with their governing board.

Not until 1979 did the United States create a Department of Education at the national level. Before that time, there existed an Office of Education which published some statistics and administered a few aid programs "...such as vocational education for the public schools, but it dared not disturb state superintendents of public instruction, much less presidents of universities.[22] With the growth of colleges and enrollments several agencies of the federal government became involved in supporting higher education. These actions, however, do not amount to a nationally administered system, or to a national "master plan" of development as is

common in other countries. The U.S. system, noted Clark, "...remains the most unorganized and approximates a market of freely interacting competitive units."[23] Even though there is a tendency toward a multi-controlled order, "market conditions" seem to be the steering element.

Governance of American Universities. An Overview of Some of its Elements.

At first glance the governance of American colleges and universities has not changed in the last hundred years. The same well known common features - board of trustees, presidency, faculty senate, academic departments, administrative officials, etc. - can be found with slight variations among American colleges and universities. The relationship of higher education to the state, seen at a glimpse, does not seem to have changed dramatically since the early nineteenth century. The role of the state in regard to private higher education is widely seen as unchanged since the significant decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in favor of Dartmouth College's right to autonomy. Indeed, the 1982 Carnegie report on university governance points out how in that important decision, the *privilege* of the British sovereign granting powers to trustees was converted into a *right* for them to manage the college "without legislative interference."[24]

Is it possible that the governing of American colleges has remained unchanged despite the enormous

transformations of American society in the 20th century, or despite the appearance of new institutions of higher learning and the general spectacular expansion of the system? The short answer is no, of course. It is necessary to explore the nature of the change in the governance of American universities, and to explore the main factors, inside and outside universities, producing and/or conditioning change in governance structures. In order to frame this interaction between governance and influencing factors in sociological terms, some theoretical models of change in organizations will be analyzed.

To explore these changes in organization four main aspects are involved: First, a general description of some of the changes with which American colleges have experimented in recent years; second, a brief discussion of the models that could provide a logical explanation of the relationship among the various elements involved in that process of change; third, a display of evidence in the critical areas or variables outlined by the theoretical models; and, finally, an attempt to draw some conclusions and to note some loose ends that will need further investigation.

Growth and Change, a constant in American higher education

One of the most interesting studies about growth and change in higher education is that written by Martin Trow

in 1973. In that study, Trow showed how the wide range of changes in higher education had as a common denominator the growth of institutions and the system. He argued that most of the problems affecting higher education could only be fully understood if seen as a consequence of growth in the system. For Trow, clear and distinctive differences can be found in higher education in three historical phases: elite, mass, and universal higher education.[25] Especially important was the process occurring in the transition from elite to mass higher education, which had been taking place in developed countries in the second half of the 20th century.

In the particular case of the United States, the system of higher education grew, from enrolling about four percent of the correspondent age grade [18-23 years] by the turn of the century, to a mass system covering almost half of the age grade, and nearly 60 percent of high school graduates.[26] Because of that enormous growth, almost no area of higher education was left unchanged, although perhaps the changes in administration and governance are some of the most unnoticed. Differentiation is another consequence of growth and of great interest in this case, for it purports a change in the very physiognomy of universities. New schools, new academic programs, and new curricular content are a logical consequence and a manifestation of growth. However, a clear-cut relationship between growth and school differentiation

cannot be easily found in the case of the governance function of universities.

Growth and Organizational Differentiation

Hawley and the Bolands (1965) showed the direct relationship between university size and administration. They surveyed nearly one hundred public four-year colleges comparing the number of faculty members with the number of full-time administrators. The authors found a high correlation (0.822) between administrative staff and total faculty, and a large coefficient of regression (0.813) "of administrative size on faculty size."[27] This is a rigorous confirmation of observable trends. The consequences of growth for governance structures, however, are different depending on whether a few institutions evolve to become mass institutions or the system is built upon the multiplication of colleges and universities. In any case, there is an impact of growth on administration and governance. In his study, Trow distinguished between the effects of distinct *types* of growth (rate of growth, absolute size, and the proportion of the relevant age grade) over higher education. When elite institutions are transformed into large institutions, radical changes take place in their particular milieux. "Large size affects the *norms* as well as the *structures* of higher education."[28]

Several authors have noted these transformations. Parsons and Platt singled out a "differentiation of administrative organization," and the evolution of "technological complexity" in universities as processes "producing growth in the bureaucratic component of academic organization."[29] Clark conceived the result of growth as an evolution from a unitary to a federal structure, "from unitary liberal arts colleges to multistructural colleges and universities."[30] Those changes, however, meant more than a cumulative process. As Clark noted, they have impacted the exercise and distribution of authority. Organizational differentiation then has produced delegation of authority among new subunits: schools, departments, divisions, institutes, centers, programs, etc. Another process - detected by Parsons and Platt - occurring simultaneously, is the transference of certain functions from faculty to administrative hands.

Scholars, Administrators, and Students

That transference is precisely one of Trow's keystones in his analysis of academic administration in the transition from elite to mass higher education. Small colleges and universities were run by academics usually on a part-time basis. As a consequence of growth, mass institutions tend to be managed at their top levels by men "who were formerly academics but who now are clearly full-

time university administrators."[31] Moreover, since the functions of universities are now multiple and complex, there is a trend to staff some administrative areas with full-time professionals. Those areas are budget management, information systems, and long range planning among others. A more rational administration then is another of the changes produced by growth in the system. Large institutions have to establish a rational and bureaucratic structure so they can function efficiently. Sooner or later, the cost/benefit calculation becomes prevalent in university administration.

Among academic ranks the administrative posts and task-forces are considered a helpful appendix in support of teaching and research. However, according to a characterization of Parsons and Platt, some university administrators are taking a more aggressive role regarding growth and direction of change of institutions. Also, as a consequence of growth, argued Trow, new faculty members surpassed the number of senior faculty. New relations and a new culture began to develop among scholar ranks. In the more radical quarters, the senior faculties may have become a "professorial oligarchy." The most far-reaching outcome of the constant addition of new faculty, according to Trow, was the breakdown of academic consensus.

Often, the challenge to the authority of the "professorial oligarchy" came not only from junior staff but also from students, as occurred in several countries in the

1960s. Trow's argument was that, during the transition from elite to mass higher education, the students often claimed some participation in university decisions, in part because they thought of a college education as a right and not as a privilege.[32] In turn, the internal struggles in universities may have prompted external intervention to solve the conflicts in a process in which "effective power...flow(s) out of the colleges and universities into the hands of political authorities."[33]

Scholars, Administrators...and state officials

The transition from elite to mass higher education modified therefore the nature of universities as organizations in the United States. Two key elements in that process were the "standardizing force of central government control" and the "leveling influence of the new forms of rationalized management and administration." However, the impact of growth in the particular case of the United States has been attenuated by some particular features of the system. Apparently, the land-grant universities and the reemergence of the old colleges set up a system "structurally and normatively" prepared to respond in a flexible manner to the requirements of growth.[34] Another key factor seems to have been central in facilitating a non-conflictive transition from elite to mass higher education: the absence of rigid governmental control. Strongly centralized systems, such as

the French, are more likely to inhibit adaptive incremental change. "Autonomous and competitive universities" are much more responsive to social forces. The governing board is another feature of American higher education that has made it more sensitive to external influences and, at the same time, has buffered attempts from outside to control universities and colleges.

In summary, factors influencing change have been the general character of growth in student enrollment, faculty, and administrative staff in universities as well as some of the changes generated by that growth. The approach of Trow has been particularly useful in this review. Some questions, however, remain unanswered. Certainly growth is an element that underlies all the modifications in the system of higher education, but what are the logical/causal links capable of explaining the relationships among the elements of higher education? What are those areas of university governance that were more affected by the growth and why? In short, a theoretical framework is needed, a model of logical relationships to understand the evolution of governance in American universities.

Some Theoretical Approaches to Change in American University Governance.

Because we are dealing with a dynamic process, it is necessary to have a model capable of explaining the

changes operating in the governance structure of American universities, and the dynamics of redistribution of power and influence among the elements of such structure. Therefore, the model or models required need to be able to address at least two issues: a) *differentiation* processes in organizations, and b) dynamics of *authority, power,* and *influence* in organizations.

There exists, among some scholars, a deeply rooted conviction in the sense that universities operate as a community or collegium of scholars. Quite representative of this sentiment is a statement by Miller:

> *"I do not believe that the concept of hierarchy is a realistic representation of the interpersonal relationship which exists within a college or university. Nor do I believe that a structure of hierarchy is a desirable prescription for the organization of a college or a university."*[35]

Other authors have acknowledged the existence of two distinct elements within universities: the collegial and the bureaucratic element, (Clark, 1977 and Parsons & Platt, 1975) the latter being subsidiary of the former. Clark, for instance, asserted that "professional authority" has replaced "collegial authority" in the running of colleges. In a society tending to be composed of experts, he argued, "Expertise is a dominant characteristic of the campus, and *organization and authority cluster around it.*"[36]

Conceiving colleges and universities as communities of scholars or of experts does not help if we are interested

in the analysis of how those communities are ruled. The approach of collegial authority may be useful in explaining some departmental relationships in large universities or the broader picture in small schools, but not in addressing governance of an entire university or a state system of higher education. Even though expertise holds some undeniable authority and influence, these powers are usually confined to the classroom, the laboratory, and the academic department. That authority has less effect on university policy-making.

Universities as Bureaucracies

Considering universities as bureaucratic organizations seems to be a good track in the exploration of university government. Colleges and universities have the essential characteristics of bureaucracies. They are complex organizations, have public responsibilities, and have been chartered or authorized by a state government. Universities normally have a formal hierarchy and a set of rules spelling the duties and powers of each one of their divisions and units along with a rational definition - and delimitation - of authority. The government of universities is, therefore, formally based on their regulations and procedures. Under this perspective, there is no mystery as to how the institutions are managed: specific bodies - like governing boards - are in charge of policy formulation; top officials function as executive branches and junior administrators are

responsiole for "applying the norm," and most decisions are then rationally made.[37]

Baldridge noted, however, that even though the "bureaucratic paradigm" is useful to explain the formal structure of universities, it does not provide explanations as to the processes or dynamics of the structure, nor does it address the process of setting policies. Indeed, as Pfeffer pointed out, the dynamic of government and differentiation in organizations cannot only be explained -as does the bureaucratic approach- in terms of efficiency and management; it is necessary to look at "...the politics of organizational structures as well."[38] The author mentioned how the creation of certain types of units such as affirmative action, consumer affairs, and public relations units, can be regarded as cases of "protest absorption," in which a merely apparent solution is institutionalized. Thus, the rational bureaucratic arrangement of levels and responsibilities is influenced by the interplay of group and/or individual interests. Groups, sections, and/or individuals tend to use the structural characteristics of organizations in order to increase their influence in directing organizational goals and objectives. As a result, a thorough explanation of governance processes can only be reached by taking into account the political features of organizations. This is precisely the approach developed by Baldridge in 1968 while he was analyzing decision making at New York University.

The Political Model

Baldridge built a model attempting to explain the articulation of interests and the interaction among different elements in university decision making. This "political model," as he called it, operates under the assumption that groups of teachers, administrators, students, and external pressure groups interact in colleges and universities trying to defend their interests and to advance their positions. These political actors "emerge from the complex fragmented social structure of the university, drawing on the divergent concerns and lifestyles of hundreds of miniature subcultures."[39] In such a context, the policies expressing university governance are the outcome of a complex process of pressure, resistance, power, and influence. Far from the romantic conceptions of universities as peaceful communities of scholars, the political model conceives them as composed of competing power blocs and interest groups.

The main assumptions of Baldridge's political model are as follows: a) conflict is a natural component of university governance; b) small groups or elites decide on major matters; c) formal authority has to be exercised under political pressure and very often as a bargaining process; d) there is a democratic tendency symbolized by student protest; and, e) there is a strong external influence. University governance thus is essentially a decision making process -

carried out by individuals or groups in conflicting circumstances- which takes place in or through the formal bureaucratic structures of colleges and universities. Bureaucratic arrangements are the field in which individuals play the decision making game.

The main stages of operation of this model are: 1) *Social structure*, which encompasses the external influence whether by social trends or groups, and the social characteristics of the context; 2) *Interest articulation* of the different groups regarding distinct issues; 3) *Legislative stage* in which negotiations, pressures, playing of influence, consultation, work of committees, etc., take place; 4) *Formulation of policy* through the established official channels, often taking the form of a public announcement; 5) *Execution of Policy* through the administration for routine execution.[40]

In 1978, Baldridge revised his political model and made some important adjustments. One limitation he recognized was that the key elements of the model were drawn from a single case, that of New York University. The different political dynamics among colleges and universities therefore might challenge the assumptions underlined by the model. Another constraint in the model's explicative power was that it did not adequately assess the force of routine bureaucratic processes, since "Many decisions are made not in the heat of political controversy but because standard

operating procedures dominate in most organizations"[41] Accordingly, in his later version the model took into account long-term decision patterns and changes in structures, such as centralization of decision making, the dynamics of departmental power, and the growth of unionization.

A third limitation of the model resided in the excessive focus on the internal processes of governance and decision making. Therefore, Baldridge proposed to lend more attention to the influence of "environmental factors," such as political relationships of universities with the state and other social institutions and groups.

In the articulation of the two models -universities as bureaucracies and as political arenas- we find a powerful instrument for the analysis of university governance. For the outcomes of political processes in policy making have to be imprinted sometimes in posts, bodies, or hierarchical levels. The formal bureaucratic structure of governance is the symbolic and legal representation of consolidated political processes occurring in the universities. Referring to this process of incarnating conflict and power into concrete hierarchies in organizations, Pfeffer wrote, "The design of an organization, its structure, is first and foremost the system of control and authority by which the organization is governed."[42]

The theoretical framework most suitable for the analysis of university governance seems to be that provided

by Baldridge's political model. This model needs, however, to be grounded in the recognition that colleges and universities operate as bureaucracies and, also, by the contribution of Pfeffer in the sense that policy outcomes very often become solidified in new posts or hierarchical levels thus reshaping the organizations' design.

Some Changes in the Governance of American Universities.

Based on the characteristics of the models briefly reviewed above, it is possible to isolate the main elements whose interaction shape university governance. In principle, we should look at the formal structure: governing board, presidency, administrative staff, deanships, chairmen, bodies representing faculties, students, and non-faculty staff. Each of these elements has a role in decision making. Changes in the governance structure are indeed changes in that general structure and/or in the types of relationship among them. The dynamics of governance -or the cumulative decision making process- may be analyzed in terms of Baldridge's political model, which includes external influences upon the governing of colleges. This theoretical framework seems to be complete. Its validity will depend on the explanatory and predictive powers of the concepts.

Social Forces and the State

An increase in enrollment meant both a size increase in most institutions, which led to an additional increment in faculty members and administrators, and the creation of new institutions. What is not completely clear is how these processes affected the traditional forms of governing higher education. Neil J. Smelser has argued that competing value-expectations not only have been felt but also institutionalized in colleges and universities. In addition, some areas, "estates and subestates," have had an uneven development within universities. The external pressures generated by distinct social forces have established a type of conflict in universities. On one side, the increase in students has been accompanied by a generalized view of higher education as a means of social and intergenerational mobility, a perspective often coupled with the view of universities as a powerful instrument to advance economic development. On the other side, stand "those who place a premium on the university as a safeguard of academic...tradition."[43] This type of conflict may prompt a process of articulation of interests and start a dynamic in governance arrangements. Social issues such as minority access to higher education also introduce in universities some forms of conflict which in turn may alter the formal structure and operating norms of the institutions.[44]

State governments play a double role in this context. Sometimes they intervene in university conflicts to settle particular disputes. Sometimes the state is the carrier or representative of social forces or demands for universities. The first role can be appreciated in a tendency - noted by Smelser - to direct intervention from trustees, regents, and legislators in the government of universities when the latter are undergoing harsh conflicts. He drew his observation from the "heightened politicization of universities during the period 1964-70; when state governments often passed regulations for student conduct and set up new restrictive job requirements for faculties."[45]

The second role played by state government is more evident in its funding policies toward public higher education. Whatever the reason argued, state governments introduce criteria of social opportunity, rational distribution, and accountability in the assignment of public funds to colleges and universities. Martin Trow has pointed out how higher education has to compete for public funds with other sectors of the state or of society, in general. Since the state becomes more involved in economic support of colleges and universities, people and government begin to question whether to grant them public monies and if given how they should be spent. Although specific questions as to how the government relates to universities regarding public financing can only be answered by research of particular

cases, what becomes a general trait of American higher education is the presence of state governments in policy making for colleges and universities, especially those publicly supported. In the past, as Clark noted, neither state nor national governments "had any important degree of control over the differentiation of institutions and sectors..." of higher education. Now authority has been flowing within the campus to a stronger administration and, outside universities, to a "greatly strengthened superstructure" of multicampus administration, state superboards, and state government planning and control.[46]

Forms of State Intervention

There are several forms of state regulation and/or intervention in university governance. In 1982 the Carnegie survey on campus decision making found state governments controlling decisions on matters such as administrative classifications, institutional membership in national organizations, fund-raising campaigns, transfers between budget categories, and certain purchases. An example was given as to the federal grants whose recipients were required to comply with 59 legislative and regulatory norms related to forms of administration and social policy.[47] A study by Robert Cope in 1978 classified thirteen "means of systematic intervention" of the Washington State government in higher education. Some of them were: executive orders, contractual

controls, board appointments, and coordinating boards.[48] The authors of the Carnegie report concluded that "...the most serious problem encountered by higher education is the *cumulative* impact of government intervention," which has had the effect of reshaping the institutions in "fundamental ways."[49]

However, the more visible and broad form of state intervention in the governance of colleges and universities seems to be the relatively new coordinating agencies. In his study of statewide coordinating agencies, Robert Berdahl found a trend from state governments to grant more regulatory powers to coordinating boards. His data show the increasing intervention of states in higher education development.

Table 7 Number of states in each category of coordinating agency.

Category	1939	1969
No state agency	33	2
Voluntary association	0	2
Coordinating board	2	27
Consolidated governing board	15	19
Total	50	50

Source: Berdahl, Robert *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971. Table 4, p. 35

Coordinating boards with some regulatory powers increased from 1 in 1939 to 14 in 1969. It has to be

distinguished, however, that the existence of coordinating agencies does not necessarily mean *direct* intervention in particular universities, but it *does* entail a constraint, a delimitation of certain boundaries for self-government. State coordinating agencies may also act as specialized monitors of higher education development whereas state officials, legislators, and the governor's office have the power to dictate specific measures. As the Carnegie report complained in 1982, "The ever increasing role of outside agencies in campus matters is gradually wearing down internal governance structures."[50] And this influence is not limited to management and procedures, it also reaches academic programs which, under the pressure for accountability, are increasingly being evaluated by state agencies.

It is significant that Berdahl began his book discussing the differences, boundaries, and conflicts between *autonomy* of universities and *public interest*. That is precisely the crossroad of university governance and the social forces represented by the state. The problem, wrote Berdahl, is to determine whether state interventions are "necessary" or "marginal" safeguards of the public interest, or "actual threats to the essential ingredients of autonomy."[51] Those distinctions are the subject of political negotiation in a typical "legislative process" as conceptualized by Baldridge. In any circumstance, however, it seems clear that state action through procedural measures or

by means of coordinating agencies has become a permanent influencing element in the governance of American colleges and universities.

Faculty Senates and Unions

Another area of radical change in university governance is the appearance of unions in many American colleges, In a period of five years, 1968 to 1973 the number of institutions contracting by means of collective bargaining increased from nine to one-hundred and fifty-six. It occurred in a period of economic stringency for higher education, the result of a decline in the funds allocated for higher education from three main sources: state and federal governments and the private sector. Collective bargaining was a natural reaction to this constraint, in which even the tenure conditions began to be reviewed.[52] A few years later, however, collective bargaining in private institutions was discouraged mainly due to a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which regarded faculty members of a university (Yeshiva) not as employees but as managers (or performing managerial functions) and, therefore, as part of the university's administration; a condition that impeded them to gather in a union and to claim collective bargaining.

The role of professors in the governance of American colleges has historically occurred through faculty senates and departmental mechanisms. After the Civil War,

academic senates and academic departments became, according to the 1982 Carnegie report, the main locus for faculty participation in governance. Clark noted the phenomenon of segmentation of faculty power in university decision making, segmentation by "subcollege", division, and particularly by department. This approach led Clark to think of university governance in terms of a federal system, "with men elected from the various 'states' coming together in a federal center to legislate general rules, which are then executed by the administration of faculty committees...."[53] In this line of reasoning, academic senates would be those privileged places for deliberation and policy making. Instead, it seems that faculty bodies are not fulfilling their purposes. The Carnegie Commission found, in 1981, that 737 campuses -most of them publicly funded- had faculty represented by an elected bargaining agent. The authors also found that faculty participation in academic senates had declined and, furthermore, that many faculty councils were not addressing critical issues in their institutions.[54]

A survey of 240 colleges and universities by Baldridge and Kemerer in 1971 and 1974 showed that 56 percent of university presidents thought the influence of academic senates had decreased during that period of time; 37 percent of the chairpersons, however, thought senates had increased their influence. The overall assessment of the authors of the survey was that weak faculty senates in dealing with salary

negotiations led during the early 197Us to unionization in certain kinds of institutions. Apparently, two characteristics constitute the most important limitations of academic senates in the governing process: a) their typical advisory nature, and b) low rates of faculty participation.[55] The senates' place in the formal structure of colleges and universities is, perhaps, their main weakness. Typically, senates "operate on delegated authority and depend on institutional appropriations and staffing."[56]

It seems that senates and unions are called to play different roles in university governance. With no place in the formal structure, faculty unions, in those institutions which have gone to collective bargaining, play the role of articulating faculty interests concerning salary issues and work conditions. Senates will probably continue to provide institution-wide policy on academic matters, while departments deal with the day-to-day affairs of individual faculty members. Meanwhile the top levels of administration will deal most directly with such matters as budget, long-range planning, staffing, etc.[57] Indeed, Martin Trow labeled the coexistence of university administration and academic senates as *cogovernance*, a form in which academic senates tend to have a large influence in academic matters such as curriculum definition, certification of courses, and graduation standards, among others, while administrative officers usually hold information and authority to decide on

institutional size and growth, facilities construction and maintenance, public relations and the relationship with government agencies.

The term *cogovernance*, asserted Trow, "...Refers to the ongoing process of administrators consulting academicians, ordinarily through standing or ad hoc committees of faculty members organized through the machinery of an academic senate.[58] Trow's argument is that authority of university presidents in the traditional college began to be supplemented by faculty members as the academic profession consolidated its authority over scholar issues.[59] On the other side, a strong presidency is a requirement of a system of higher education mainly composed of independent and competitive institutions, because "entrepreneurial leadership" is vital for "institutions highly dependent on sources of external support..."[60]

Summary

Some consequences of growth in American higher education, especially those affecting the governance function, have been briefly reviewed. Some theoretical approaches were discussed and their usefulness evaluated to explain the dynamics of change in formal structures and processes of governance. Some of the variables with great explicative power are: *conflict*, as a result of distinct interests and goals of social groups, state, and academics

regarding the objectives of higher education; *articulation of interests*, as a process of group and/or individual interaction in policy making; and *formal structure change*, as the objective consequences of change in formal arrangements for university governance.

Several issues essential to university governance could not be addressed in this chapter but are of clear importance. Some of them are: a) an analysis of the role played by legislative committees on higher education as different from that played by the governor's office; b) a detailed account of how and in what areas coordinating and governing boards constrain university governance; c) student representation in governing bodies and students' influence in decision making. Such an analysis needs to be done in search of the impact of the 1960s' student protest on university governance. d) influence of accrediting agencies on faculty decision areas such as curriculum and admission/graduation requirements, and e) an analysis of how the governing boards have evolved in this changing environment. No distinction was made between public and private institutions where, in the latter, state intervention acquires different forms and produces differential results. The need of obtaining a panoramic view prevented such distinction. This chapter, however, presented some key elements in university governance; what remains is a more detailed study of the relationship

among them and the effect of their interplay in the governance of American colleges and universities.

Notes to Chapter II.- Some Factors Influencing the Evolution of Governance in American Universities.

[1] Cowley, W.H. and Williams, Don. *Historical and International Roots of American Higher Education*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1991. In print. Chapter Six.

[2] Trow, Martin. "American Higher Education-past, present, and future." *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 14, No. 1, 1989. p. 11

[3] Cowley-Williams. Chapter Seven.

[4] Cowley-Williams. Chapter Seven.

[5] Cowley-Williams. Chapter Seven.

[6] The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987. Foreword by Ernest L Boyer.

[7] The Carnegie Foundation...Op. Cit. Table 6, p. 6

[8] Stocking, Carol. "The United States." In Burton R Clark. *The School and University: An International Perspective*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1985. p. 242

[9] Trow, Martin. "American Higher Education-past, present, and future." *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 14, No. 1, 1989. p. 7.

[10] Cowley-Williams.

[11] Zumeta, William. "Higher Education Policy." In Williams, Walter. (Ed) *Washington Policy Choices 1990s*. Seattle, Wa: Institute for Public Policy and Management, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington, 1990. p. 211

[12] Bonner, Thomas N. "The Unintended Revolution In America's Colleges Since 1940." *Change*. Sept-Oct, 1986. p. 46

[13] Cowley-Williams.

[14] Bonner, Thomas N. Op. Cit. p. 49

[15] Bonner, Thomas N. Op. Cit. p. 48

[16] Bonner, Thomas N. Op. Cit. p. 49

[17] *The Almanac of Higher Education, 1989-90*. Chicago: The Editors of the Chronicle of Higher Education, The University of Chicago Press, 1990. p. 5

[18] Cowley, W.H. and Williams, Don. Op. Cit. The authors date the origins of this form of government in the fourteenth century in Italy, and they argue that it spread from the Calvinist academy to the University of Leyden, to the four Scottish universities, to Trinity College in Dublin and then to America. Chapter Five.

[19] Trow, Martin. "American Higher Education..." Op. Cit. p. 15

[20] "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." *AAUP Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, Winter, 1966. p. 10

[21] "Statement on Government..." Op. Cit. p. 10

[22] Clark, Burton R. "United States." In *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. John H. Van de Graaff, (ed). New York: Praeger, 1978. p. 104

[23] Clark, Burton R. "United States." Op. Cit. p. 117

[24] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Control of the Campus: a report on the governance of higher education*. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982. p. 10

[25] Trow, Martin. *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

[26] Trow, Martin. "The Expansion and Transformation of Higher Education." *The International Review of Education*. Vol. 18, No.1, 1972, p. 61

[27] Hawley, Amos H., Walter Boland, and Margaret Boland. "Population Size and Administration in Institutions of Higher Education." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 30, 1965, p. 253

[28] Trow, Martin. *Problems in the Transition*...1973. Op. Cit. p. 3

[29] Parsons, Talcott & Gerald M. Platt. *The American University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975. p. 380

[30] Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Organization and Authority." In Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge, *Governing Academic Organizations*. Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan Pub. Co.,1977. p. 66

[31] Trow, Martin. *Problems in the Transition*...1973. Op. Cit. p.15

[32] Trow suggests that the "severe strains and problems" experienced by many universities in the world at the end of the sixties, were a manifestation of the transition from an elite to a mass system. Indeed, in the case of France and Mexico, student unrest happened after an unprecedented increase in student enrollment in universities. Moreover, in both cases the student movement claimed a participation in university decision making.

[33] Trow, Martin. *Problems in the Transition*...1973. Op. Cit. p.18

[34] Trow, Martin. "The Expansion and Transformation..."1972. Op. Cit, p. 64

[35] Millet, John. *The Academic Community*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962. p. 5 Quoted by Baldridge, J. Victor. (Ed.) *Academic Governance. Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making*. Berkeley, CA. McCutchan Pub. Co., 1971, p. 234-5

[36] Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Organization and Authority." 1977. Op. Cit. p. 77. Emphasis added.

[37] Baldridge, Victor J. *Academic Governance*. 1971. Op. Cit. p. 3-4

[38] Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "The Micropolitics of Organization." In Marshal W. Meyer and Associates, *Environments and Organizations*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, 1978. p. 50

[39] Baldridge, Victor J. *Academic Governance. Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making*. Berkeley, CA. McCutchan Pub. Co., 1971 p. 8

[40] Baldridge, Victor J. *Academic Governance*... Op. Cit. p. 13

[41] Baldridge, J. Victor et. al. *Policy Making and Effective Leadership. A National Study of Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978. p. 42

[42] Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "The Micropolitics of Organization." 1978. Op. Cit. p. 38 In this article, Pfeffer aims to build a theory of organizational structure based on the interplay of organizational activities and structural dimensions, determinants of power and influence, and the structural outcomes of political struggle. A most expressive statement is: "Organizational structure is a picture of the governance of the organization and a determinant of who controls and decides organizational activities." Ibidem.

[43] Smelser, Neil J. "Epilogue" In Parsons &Platt. *The American University*. Op. Cit. p.399

[44] Affirmative action programs in many universities exemplify this assertion. Significantly, the University of Washington has a vice-provost to deal with "minority affairs." Also, in this university a proposal is under examination: to make some ethnic courses a requirement in undergraduate education, which is, in my opinion, a concrete "internal" manifestation of a particular area of social conflict.

[45] Smelser, Neil J. "Epilogue" In Parsons & Platt. *The American University*. Op. Cit. p. 403

[46] Clark, Burton R. "Academic Power: Concepts, Modes, and Perspectives." in John Van de Graaff. *Academic Power: Patterns of authority in seven national systems of higher education*. New York: Praeger, 1978. p. 178

[47] Carnegie Foundation... *The Control of the Campus*...Op. Cit. p. 66

[48] Cope, Robert G. *"Observations on Washington State's system of higher education with particular attention to the relationship between state government and the institutions: A report to the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education."* Mimeographed, 1979. p. 15-31

[49] Carnegie Foundation. *The Control of the Campus*... Op. Cit. p. 65-66

[50] Ibid. p. 89

[51] Berdahl, Robert *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971. p. 10

[52]...Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Organization and Authority." 1977. Op. Cit. p. 71

[53] Carnegie Foundation... *The Control of the Campus*...Op. Cit. p. 74

[54] Baldridge, J. Victor & Frank R. Kemerer. "Academic Senates and Faculty Collective Bargaining." In Riley, Gary L. and J. Victor Baldridge (Eds.) *Governing Academic Organizations*. Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan, 1977. p. 345.

[55] Baldridge & Kemerer. "Academic Senates and Faculty Collective Bargaining." Op. Cit. p. 329

[56] Ibid. p. 332

[57] Trow, Martin. "The Academic Senate as a School for University Leadership." *Liberal Education*. Vol 76, No.1 (Jan-Feb, 1990) p. 24

[58] Cowley-Williams. p. 265 In 1915 the newly created American Association of University Professors emphasized the professional functions of university professors thus setting a benchmark for academic freedom as well as for faculty authority in academic issues

[59] Trow, Martin. Ibid. p. 25

Chapter III.- The National Autonomous University of Mexico, A Case of University Governance.

The governance of a Mexican institution, the National Autonomous University of Mexico, is interesting to explore. First, however, to place this in context, a brief overview of the Mexican system of higher education, followed by a short review providing a general description of the kind of relationships nowadays existent between government and universities, is necessary.

Types of Institutions in Mexico

There exist in Mexico three kinds of institutions of higher education: universities (public and private), technical institutes, and normal schools. Table 8 shows enrollments in them in two different years.

Table 8. Enrollments by Type of Institution of Higher Education In Mexico, 1977-1984 (Thousands of Students)

	1977		1984	
Type of Institution	Public	% Private	Public	% Private
Universities	383.6	43.5	608.3	93.8
Technological Inst.	82.5	13.9	122.4	27.3
Normal Education	--	--	86.0	46.1

Source: Arredondo, Victor A. "Some Problems Affecting Higher Education in Mexico" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA. April 16-20, 1986, Table 3.

At least one public university exists in each one of the states, and two large institutions in the Country's capital, the UNAM and the Autonomous Metropolitan University (UAM), the former having more than 300,000 students and the

latter about 30,000 students. The two institutions have placed several campuses across the enormous city of Mexico. In the particular case of the UAM, it functions in three campuses each one having its own rector, each campus coordinated and evaluated by a general rector.

The extraordinary number of pupils in the case of UNAM can be explained by the fact that it includes the school grades 9 to 12. Few Mexican public universities do not have these grades within their curriculum. Students who pass through these three years are awarded a certificate which allows them to apply for the university professional schools.

Public universities are supported by state and federal governments. Most of them are autonomous, and they are regarded as the means by which the government maintains its responsibility of providing education for the people. Commonly, the specific laws issued to regulate the functioning of these universities stipulate such a conception. For instance, the first article in the Law of the University of Guadalajara shows it clearly, "The University of Guadalajara is a public corporation provided with legal powers and designated to attain in the field of higher culture the mission that is the responsibility of the state."[1]

Technical higher education is not only funded but also administered by the federal government through the Ministry of Public Education (SEP). The head institution is

the national Polytechnic Institute (IPN) created in 1937. At its creation, the IPN was thought of as an alternative to the UNAM which was trying to be an "independent" institution. Therefore, the IPN's objectives were: "a) prepare professional and technical specialists in areas required by industrial production, b) train technicians at the subprofessional level, and also workers for the various branches of the agricultural and industrial economy, and c) encourage scientific and technological research in industrial development and wise use of natural resources."[2] Today, the IPN functions like a university with a strong emphasis in engineering sciences, though it also has schools in business and administration, economics, biology, and medicine.

There also exists a group of more than eighty Technological Institutes distributed across the country. The schools forming this group began to be opened in 1970 as a program attempting to modernize education, mainly the technical type. Levy wrote that Technological Institutes were created by the government "to achieve some of its substantial objectives"; the schools had to offer technical education "...directly tied to national and regional economic needs, costing less, and attracting poorer students."[3] However, the nature of students' demands has pressed Technological Institutes to open new programs in traditional fields: business administration, public accounting, commerce, and industrial relations among others.

These programs offered by the Institutes vary from one region of the country to another; and they train in the professional level as well as in the subprofessional, which corresponds to the grades 9 to 12. Although the enrollments in the public technical sector of education did not go beyond 15% of the total, in 1984, the number of Technological Institutes duplicated the number of state universities. In 1986, there were 52 schools devoted to industry-related careers, 27 to agriculture and livestock, three to sea sciences, and one to forestry.[4]

The third branch of higher education consists of the Normal schools whose aim is to train teachers for preschool, primary, secondary, and technical education. Before 1985, the main requirement to enroll in normal education was the secondary school certificate. Since that year, however, normal education is considered an integral part of post-secondary education and, now, the requirement is to have passed through something called the "pedagogical baccalaureate" which is a kind of normal-oriented preparatory studies, covering grades 9 to 12.

With some cross-regional variation, the normal schools' curriculum is integrated into three main subject-matter areas: a) scientific-humanistic, b) physical-artistic, and c) specific professional field. The latter being a combination of pedagogy and a particular field for teaching,

such as biology, mathematic, Spanish language, social sciences, chemistry, etc.[5]

The private universities exceed in number the public ones though the student population is far smaller in the former. Most of the private universities offer few careers and the majority tend to be business administration-oriented. A few private universities are well renowned, even enjoying some degree of international prestige. That is the case of the Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico (ITAM) in Mexico City, which accordingly with some opinions (no studies on it have been accomplished) is now providing economists and administrators to the public sector. Another remarkable private university is the Monterrey Technological Institute of Higher Studies (ITESM) in the industrial city of Monterrey. It was founded by a consortium of businessmen in 1943, it has official authorization to grant its own degrees, is governed by a Board of Trustees, and enrolled more that 22,000 students in 1986-87. Perhaps the bolder accomplishment of the ITESM is its capability for expansion; by 1986-87 it has managed to open up to 28 "campuses" in 28 cities in the nation. Indeed, the ITESM offer graduate studies on part-time basis in the field of business administration.[6]

Two more private institutions are the Autonomous University of Guadalajara and the Western Technological Institute of Higher Studies, both located in the city of Guadalajara. A peculiarity of these two universities is that

their degrees are granted by the major national public university, the UNAM.[7]

Relationships Between Higher Education and the Civil Government

In this section we shall explore briefly the peculiarities of such relations, although only the public universities will be considered in the analysis. Universities very often sign cultural, technical, or research agreements with the three levels of government, local, state, and federal. In order to facilitate the analysis the governments will be regarded as unitary, instead of differentiating between the three levels. Two kinds of relations will be examined here: financing and autonomy.

Table 9. Financial Sources of Mexican Universities
(in percentages)

Sources of Income	1970	1976	1981
Federal Subsidy	23.5	52.5	62.0
State Subsidy	56.6	39.2	33.0
Tuition, Services, & other sources	19.9	8.3	5.0
Total	100	100	100

Source: Pescador, Jose Angel. "La Crisis y el Financiamiento de la Educacion Superior en Mexico." In *La Crisis de la Educacion Superior en Mexico*. Gilberto Guevara Niebla, Editor. Mexico: Ed. Nueva Imagen. 1989. (1st. Ed. 1981)

First of all it has to be said that Mexican public universities rely almost completely on the government (see Table 9) for their existence and functioning. The authorities

provide more than 90% of the universities' budget. In that provision the federal government apportions the bigger part.

This enormous financial support from the Mexican government to universities does not entail an equally big amount of control. That is one of the conclusions Levy reached in his study, "Mexico's public universities indeed find themselves in corporatist relation to their government. But our central finding in financial policy is that extent of subsidization does not determine extent of control."[8] Therefore, public universities enjoy autonomy even though they frequently suffer lack of resources.

Levy found that public university autonomy works in at least three areas that he named appointive, academic, and financial. For the first, intervention from the state is limited almost entirely to the appointment of rectors, and even in this respect very often the government is sensitive to pressures exerted by university councils, which are the universities' supreme governing bodies, usually composed of faculty representatives, student representatives, the university president, and some officers from the central administration. The appointment of rector is currently done by the state governor, although there are some other means of doing that; it can be accomplished "...(1) by the university council; (2) by the *junta de gobierno* [Governing Board, as in the National Autonomous University of Mexico]; (3) by the governor of the state from a slate of three proposed by the

council [as in Guadalajara]; (4) by the governor of the state at will; and (5) by the council or the university assembly from a slate of three proposed by the governor."[9] A couple of rare cases are those of the universities of Puebla and Sinaloa, where the rector is elected by voting of the whole university community. In this wide range, however, most of the state authorities have no formal possibility of appointing deans, chairpersons, or professors.

Secondly, in relation to academic autonomy, Levy found that "...it is the strongest of the three, as it seems to be cross-nationally. The university basically determines curriculum and exam requirements, while professors retain considerable control over course content."[10] This kind of self-government, backed by political autonomy, has prevented the constitution of a unified and coordinated system of higher education. "Naturally, public universities require government recognition, but they remain independent of compulsory coordination. How much the universities compete with one another is open to inquiry, but functional integration hardly exists."[11] National coordination, however, increases in importance when financial resources become scarce. Thus, since 1981, the federal government has established a planning structure attempting to coordinate expansion and development of Mexican higher education.

One organization that sometimes becomes a forum for general communication of universities with the federal

government is the National Association of Universities and Higher Education Institutes (ANUIES). It was created by the universities themselves in 1943 to facilitate communication and coordination. Later, the government included in it its Technological Institutes and some Normal schools. The logical outcome is that the government acquired some degree of political control over the Association and uses it as a means to set the national priorities in higher education. A key factor in that relationship is that current communication between government and universities is made on the basis of individual dealing. There is not an association of university presidents as in France (the *Conférence des Présidents d'Universités)* to consider somewhat freely the government policies: nor has the government established a special committee (as the University Grants Committee in England) to deal with universities in academic, financial, or planning matters.

Thirdly, it could fairly be stated that the financial dependence of the university on the state combines with freedom to allocate the subsidies within the institutions, being the institutions' only responsibility to report *a posteriori* the ways in which money was spent. In addition, universities have long used many ways to press the government in order to claim their share of the public budget. As Levy remarked, "Distressed over a host of university policies it can neither control nor reform, the

government at least wants to reduce its financial commitment to those policies. But the university resists government efforts to impose tuition or, indeed, most any forms of university responsibility in fund raising."[12] Besides these components of autonomy, there exists in Mexico what can be labeled a "political culture of autonomy" which is an outcome of student constant protests and anti-government activities since the beginning of the century. The concept of autonomy has evolved from self-government to a concept of territorial freedom in opposition to the state. This is particularly true for the universities in Mexico City. Guevara Niebla, a remarkable scholar in university matters wrote, "The autonomy has conferred the university a special status within the Mexican society. The university has became a space relatively free from the state's corporativist control, and also a natural place for free political expressions from the society."[13]

The student unrest in 1968 and the cruel repression dictated by the government have accentuated such a perception of autonomy by student . Many students think of the university as a free republic where they can make politics. The testimony of a visitor to the UNAM is eloquent:

> *"...groups of students sell books by Lenin, Trotsky, and Mao, and distribute leaflets devoted to a variety of leftist causes. One student explains that his group would like to organize workers and peasants, but that this is impossible because he can't even sell his group's publications outside. 'Here in the university,*

the government has given us a small margin of freedom. But elsewhere, the police would get us.'"[14]

An eloquent description of the political dimension of university autonomy in Mexico can be found in a fragment of the inaugural speech of the rector Padilla Lopez at the University of Guadalajara. The ceremony has been traditionally presided over by the governor of the state. Padilla Lopez said "The university, on its own, is one of the highest expressions of the society. It is the institutional support of culture, science, and technology. In order to achieve its specific objectives, the university claims the most complete independence and freedom... However, as an institution, the university belongs in the state's structure and in such condition, without undermining its independence and freedom, cannot and should not remain out of the government coordination... Thus, the relations between government and university must be grounded in mutual respect to its respective functions..."[15]

The National Autonomous University of Mexico

The UNAM is the oldest on the continent, and has exerted a powerful influence on the rest of the public universities in Mexico. Today, the UNAM houses more than 250,000 students and offers education from high school level to graduate programs. It has a much larger number of researchers than any other single university, and it offers one of the broadest programs of cultural diffusion.

With a few variants all public universities in Mexico have the same formal governance structure that the UNAM has. However, a very special feature of the UNAM is its governing board (Junta de Gobierno) which has similar functions to the American boards of trustees. By studying the UNAM's structure of governance, one can gain some acquaintance with most Mexican universities' modes and styles of government, for the UNAM has set a model for all of them, and because there is an enormous similarity among public universities in the country. The analysis of the largest university of Mexico, therefore, provides insight into the study of university governance in Mexico.

The Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico

The rise of formal higher education in Mexico, started formally with the establishment of the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico, in 1551. It was organized following the characteristics of the University of Salamanca and officially opened in 1553.[16] The university, medieval in its spirit, had the scholastic method at its core. The first curriculum included theology, scripture, canon law, jurisprudence, arts, and rhetoric. A few years later, in 1574, a new chair in medicine was incorporated, and in 1580, a new course in indigenous languages.[17]

The foundation of this University was perhaps the most strong influence exerted by Spain -and Europe- on the

educational history of Mexico, "...(T)he Latin-american institutions, as exemplified by the University of Mexico, were committed to the scholastic Bologna-Salamanca tradition of the Southern European universities, which had been in their golden age in the 16th century."[18]

The first signal of the Spanish influence lies in its royal creation. Contrary to the relatively spontaneous constitution of the first medieval universities (namely Bologna and Paris), the most important Spanish university, Salamanca, was created by a royal decree and supported with "public funds." That feature marks the construction of a peculiar relationship between government and universities that still today remains in Mexico. As a consequence, a university is defined not only as a corporation of scholars but also in terms of a public enterprise. The institutions must be committed, from their outset, to contribute to the national development as well as its academic goals. The royal decree founding the universities of Lima and Mexico expressed with clarity such a public commitment:

> *"In order to serve God and the public welfare of our kingdoms, it is convenient that our vassals and natural subjects have therein universities and centers of general studies where they may be instructed in all the sciences and faculties."*[19]

Another characteristic is the universities' dependence upon the royal will in colonial times and, later, upon the national government's decisions and policies.

The Spanish influence also appears in the constitutions given to the University of Mexico. Those were adapted from the Salamancan statutes by one of the members of the *Real Audiencia* (a royal court for hearings in Spanish colonies)[1] During the colonial period (1521-1810) only two other universities were created: Mérida in 1624, and Guadalajara in 1791. Thus, the University of Mexico was for about three centuries almost the sole source of professionals.

The Nineteenth Century

The rise of the nineteenth century witnessed the burst of the Mexican war of independence from Spain. Although the war lasted eleven years, more than half a century of Mexico's history was dramatically marked by a struggle between liberals and conservatives. In those years, higher education in the country was chaotically managed, and many previous gains were absurdly lost. The University of Mexico was closed and reopened several times -"...it had come to be the symbol of reactionary ideas."[2]- and so was the University of Guadalajara because they represented conservative forces. The attack from the liberals was directed at the universities as corporations closely administered by the Catholic church, and even though the universities were closed, their schools continued to work loosely.

The National University

Another important effort to launch a modern higher education in Mexico was undertaken by Justo Sierra. A national University for Mexico "...was one of Sierra's long cherished dreams..."[22] Being the Secretary of Public Instruction, he convinced President Porfirio Diaz and obtained his authorization to open the National University of Mexico in 1910. The new institution had nothing to do with its antecedent. Sierra made it clear enough in his speech at the opening ceremony:

> *"The University has no history; the Pontifical University is not the antecedent, it is the past; the new University desires to base itself fundamentally on scientific investigation..."*[23]

Sierra's project was inspired by the French model of university as a national institution guiding and supervising the lower levels of education. He thought that the state's responsibility to provide education should be administered by the university. "The State," as interpreted by Irma Wilson, "with its function of inspection and not of direct teaching, would reserve for itself the revision of important measures and the higher administration of the university. Such a university, consisting of a large part of the schools...would serve as a 'crown' to the vast teaching organism the State sustained."[24] As in colonial times, the university claimed to be *the* agency of the state to direct the national efforts in education. At its re-opening the National University congregated the existing schools: the

National Preparatory, the schools of Jurisprudence, Medicine, Engineering, Fine Arts, and a new one, the National School of Advanced Studies. Had not the Mexican Revolution begun two months after the creation of the University, perhaps the aspiration of Justo Sierra would have become a reality. Nevertheless, the university kept those schools which hardly functioned during the armed conflict.

In 1920, a most remarkable educator and philosopher, José Vasconcelos, was appointed rector of the National University and he attempted to reorient it toward popular needs. In his inaugural speech he invited the University's professors to join the revolutionary government efforts in education. He claimed:

> *"...we need to build an alliance to redeem ourselves by means of the work, the virtue, and the knowledge....the contemporary revolutions need the intellectuals and the artists but with the condition that their knowledge and art must serve to improve the people's conditions of life."*[25]

As a result of Vasconcelos's efforts, President Obregon created the Ministry of Public Education in 1921 as a federal agency to provide, manage, and supervise basic education and normal schools across the nation. Vasconcelos, appointed head of the new office, began an extraordinary educational campaign that later would consolidate the salient role of the federal government in education. Meanwhile, the National University remained reluctant to enter into a frank collaboration with the revolutionary government.

National University's Autonomy and the Reform of Cordoba

Many factors intervened in the process whereby the National University of Mexico was granted autonomy in 1929. There had been resistance from the University to incorporate itself into the revolutionary movement. The former was an elite institution providing higher education for the rich families, while the latter was a movement led by middle-class individuals and largely composed of peasants and blue-collar workers. Another element was the cross-continental influence generated by the students who reformed the means of governance in Argentinean universities. The Mexican student movement actively claimed autonomy as early as the year 1923. Previously, in 1921, an international conference of students took place in Mexico City where the Cordoba process of reform was enthusiastically discussed. The 1923 students' proposal to the government contained basically:

a) the university's right to decide its own organization
b) freedom to appoint and dismiss teaching staff and administrative personnel,
c) freedom to decide the use of the economic subsidy granted by the Ministry with the sole responsibility of reporting afterwards,
d) the rector would not be freely named by the President of the Republic, but chosen from a slate of three presented to him by the university council.[26]

After a few conflicts, the government issued a law for the university in 1929 granting it the desired autonomy.

Cordoba's influence, however, continued in Mexico. In 1933 was held a conference called the "Congreso de Universitarios Mexicanos," which attempted to define the "social responsibility" of Mexican universities in the future of the nation. A Latin-American writer asserted that "... Mexicans and Argentines dominated the conference with their impassioned devotion to social rehabilitation..."[27] The meeting was organized during a moment of radicalization in the Mexican Revolution known as the socialist period in education, which lasted until 1941. During the 1930s the National University was strongly criticized for its lack of solidarity with the government. As Levy stated "...(U)ntil 1940, the revolutionary government challenged the university on three grounds: (1) that higher education was less important socially than grade school education; (2) that the university had specific responsibilities to revolutionary society; (3) that autonomy meant a debilitating 'state within the state.'"[28]

Since 1929, even though the university was autonomous, the government has provided the financial support for its operation. In 1933, however, the government decided to grant the university more complete autonomy, including the suspension of economic subsidies. It was labeled an unimportant institution, "independent of government and revolution." By means of the law of 1933, the government suppressed the university's character of "national" and,

after granting a specific amount oi money, suspended the annual subsidy. Four years later, in 1937, the government decreed the foundation of the National Polytechnic Institute in an attempt to substitute for the university a loyal institution in which the revolutionary educational policy would be realized. President Cárdenas created the Polytechnic to meet the nation's development needs "...while the university was isolated in its experiment with full autonomy..."[29]

Decisive or not, the influence of the Cordoba reform was present not only in the autonomic process, but also in shaping the forms of university governance. As Levy generalized, "The Cordoba reform introduced a unique practice -cogovernment- to Latin America."[30]

Besides student participation in university governing bodies, autonomy is another important feature of Latin-American universities. Indeed, university autonomy is one of the most conspicuous issues in state-university relationships. For Latin-American universities, autonomy purports, at least: a) freedom to decide their means of government -within certain legal limits- and the so-called appointive autonomy; b) unrestricted decision making in academic matters; and, c) financial liberty in the allocation of their subsidies and other economic resources.

University autonomy has been acknowledged in Latin-American universities since the second decade of this

century. A study by García Laguardia found the first mention of autonomy in an Uruguayan Constitution, in 1917, just one year before the reform of Córdoba. In Guatemala, the 1921 Constitution stated:

> *"The university shall organize and direct the teaching of the professions. It shall make its statutes, appoint its teachers and employees, and preserve its buildings. The university shall have legal power of representation as to acquire 'goods and chatels' and administer them and its own income."*[31]

National governments gave constitutional status to university autonomy later in this century in Bolivia, 1930; Ecuador, 1945; Panama, 1972, and Mexico in 1973, among others.

The Mexican state has given to public universities a peculiar feature: they are defined as public corporations and treated as decentralized agencies. Garcia Laguardia, who surveyed 32 state constitutions, found that "They belong to the government apparatus [and]...have been created by state legislatures in order to provide public education."[32]

1944, Once again National University

1944 was a decisive year in the shaping of the modern UNAM. At least two events made that a year of great significance: first, the university re-gained its public character, which meant essentially receiving public funds as before 1933, and to bear again the label of "National" in its name; second, it reaffirmed its autonomy by means of a new

Organic Law issued by the National Congress. The window of opportunity for reform was opened by a conflict originated in a group of students and professors protesting against a rectorial decision. The then rector of the UNAM, Brito Foucher, was accused of using his position to run for the presidency of the republic, and of being a conservative and a fascist. Apparently, the strikers were backed by some officials of the government and after a few weeks of struggle the rector was forced to resign.

After that, the President of Mexico, Avila Camacho, summoned six ex-rectors to his office and asked them to act as a special committee with the main responsibility of establishing a "constituent university council" which, in turn, would draft a new law for the university. The committee was also asked to appoint a provisional rector who would supervise the process of reforming the governance structure of the institution. The presidential intervention was illegal, but "No one complained of this violation of university autonomy and the law..." because, in part, the situation was one of emergency.[33]

The returning of the university to the governmental patronage resolved its financial problems and gave it a new law. It also meant, however, that professors and students would not participate -through the university council- in the appointment of rector, for the new Organic Law created a governing board (Junta de Gobierno) whose chief

responsibility was to do so. Therefore, the 1944 law and the 1945 statutes radically modified the balance of forces in the governance of the UNAM.

The new governing structure of the university was composed of three bodies, the rectorship, the directors of schools, institutes, and departments, and school technical councils. The rector and directors of schools were given the charge of conducting the institution and executing the resolutions of the university council. The appointive powers of the rector were limited to proposing three candidates to direct each school and institute, and the final decision was to be made by the governing board. The heads of administrative departments and units were to be named by the rector. The key decisions to govern the institution were split among governing board, university council, and managing board (Patronato). The first - with 15 members - was granted powers to appoint the rector and the directors of schools and institutes, and to resolve conflicts between university authorities. The second body - composed of rector, directors of schools, institutes, and representatives of professors, students, and employees - was given the powers of regulation over academic and administrative matters, and to legislate the norms for university functioning. Finally, the managing board, composed of members appointed by the governing board, was charged with the management of the properties, assets,

Most Mexican universities have as their supreme body not a governing board, but a university council integrated in a similar manner to that of the UNAM. In the majority of them, however, professors and students tend to be equally represented, as do the administrative officials. Thus, a typical council is composed of three equally large numbers of administrative officials, professors, and students. The range of authority of these councils is quite broad, and it includes the power to appoint the rector or to propose candidates to state governors, to decide on academic and administrative matters, and to decide on the distribution of resources among the units of the institution. Thus, the most common unit of governance in Mexican state universities is the university council.[34] All of them claim to be democratic bodies -a body of equals in a republic of scholars- but very often they function as "confused parliaments" or become rubber stamp bodies while the real power is exercised by the rectors.

The case of UNAM is different due, in part, to its conflictive relationships with the "revolutionary state" during the 1920s and 1930s. A governing board was the best solution envisaged in 1944 to resolve internal conflicts and, at the same time, to preserve the university's autonomy from state direct intervention.[35]

UNAM-Federal Government, an odd couple

Latin American universities have played, in general, an outstanding role in national politics. Many of them have, indeed, a tradition of combativeness opposing unpopular governmental policies and voicing the unconformity of non-privileged social groups. Students, and very often the professors, constitute a political ground upon which the universities have based their protests. "Control of the university has long been a concern of governments in Latin America," noted McGinn and Street, because since the reform movement of Cordoba in 1918, "the university has been the locus of subversive groups, and the motor of democratic movements, rebellions, and revolutions..."[36]

In Mexico, the conflicts between the UNAM and the national government have their origins in the overt intention of the latter to subject the former to its revolutionary policies in education of the early 1920s.[37] More recently, however, the nature of the conflicts between them have changed. Since 1944 the government has committed itself to provide economic resources to the UNAM, and since then it has become a mass institution with a complex set of problems. Many of those problem are caused by conflicting roles assigned to the university by distinct social groups. There is a conflict arising naturally from the clash of different value-expectations regarding institutional goals.[38] Many professors and researchers are committed to their academic

tasks and the pursuing of their interests, whereas the government is constantly pressing for programs oriented to promote economic development. University planners suggest the opening of training programs, while thousands of students see the liberal professions as a means of social mobility upwards.[39]

The most conflicting role, however, is the use of the institution by many groups to participate in national politics. Shapira has perceptively synthesized the "political" role of the UNAM: "In a context where channels for the transmission of demand and representation of interests are effectively controlled by the elite and where virtually all the classical political structures for interest articulation and aggregation...are essentially captive, coopted and lacking in autonomy, the function of interest aggregation was assumed by a non-captive, sociopolitical group...the university community."[40]

The political activity displayed by the university may be: a) promoted by the highest formal authorities -usually the rector- as in the case of demanding an increase in the funds granted by the state; b) prompted by an internal conflict -typically a student protest or a faculties/employees strike demanding higher wages- and transcending the UNAM's boundaries; and, c) initiated by a political party -either from right or left- to challenge the national government.

The UNAM tradicionally has had a say in Mexican politics. McGinn and Street acknowledge that the university "is a major social and political force in its own right," due, in part, to its peculiar history and to the "sensitivity" it has to perceive and express solidarity with some demands of low socio-economic status groups, and also because the government is somewhat sensitive about criticism by university renowned intellectuals.[41]

The 1968 student movement was decisive in gaining from the government this kind of respect for the political power of the university and especially of its students. The 1968 protest began as an internal conflict between two rival groups of students. What really triggered its eruption was, first the violent intervention of the police and then the absolute unwillingness of the government to dialogue and negotiate with the students. The protest was not directed against the university authorities but to the national government. The students organized themselves very well and constituted a National Strike Committee with representatives from diverse student associations. Intensively politicized, the student movement accused government officials of authoritarian and undemocratic behavior. They in essence were questioning the very legitimacy of the political system. The students demanded - before they were brutally repressed in October 2, 1968 - a broad democratization of Mexican politics and the government's intervention to correct social and

economic injustices by means of a "...more equitable distribution of opportunities and national income."[42]

Shapira argued that the student protest had a notable impact on governmental policies two years later and during the presidential period of Luis Echeverría (1970-76). Some of the most salient effects described by him are:

a) a process of cooptation of young leaders and professors, who thus were given posts in the new government;

b) a "multifaceted strategy" for higher education which included an enormous increase in federal appropriations along with a proposal of reform and development for public universities, a conciliatory policy, and an attempt to reduce the weight of the UNAM in higher education by creating alternative institutions - a new public university in Mexico City and a new system of high school institutions;

c) an amnesty of imprisoned leaders of the National Strike Committee, and

d) a "democratic opening" manifested both in a new tolerant attitude towards opposition political parties, and in an attempt - which later proved to be a failure - to reform and democratize the government party.[43]

The relationship between UNAM and state have been difficult because of the different value expectations of the several groups involved, and because of the political role that the UNAM undeniably plays in Mexican politics. This section may well be concluded with the assertion of Lomnitz:

"Within a political system which features few institutionalized outlets for dissent, the critical role of the university is of essential importance."[44] Such "critical role" has made it difficult for the UNAM to keep its right to self-government as will be shown in the next section.

Autonomy and Public Funds

Some authors think that autonomy is a very relative concept whose content is subject to political negotiation and whose boundaries are largely limited to the extent that public institutions depend on governmental subsidies.[45] In the particular case of the UNAM there are two conflicting interpretations. Camp believed that the university is only semi-autonomous while Levy found that "extent of subsidization does not determine extent of control." Whereas Camp thought that since the university is economically supported by the state "extensive manipulation is possible," Levy contended that the UNAM is not easily controllable.[46]

Apparently appointive and academic autonomy are quite indisputable. The rector and the governing board have been able to decide on the appointment of faculty and administrative officials, though often resisting external pressures. Also, the university council has proved capable of determining the norms for hiring, promotion, and dismissing of teaching staff. On the other side, the UNAM's schools and institutes determine their own curriculum and they also

decide on suppression or modification of programs, and on the adoption of new ones. Professors and researchers enjoy academic freedom (libertad de cátedra), a time-honored principle since 1933.

Financial autonomy, however, is so far more problematic. Certainly the national government has used resource allocation to exert some control over the political attitudes of the UNAM. McGinn and Street noted that the Mexican case is a very good illustration of the "importance of resource allocation as a means of mediating conflicts of interest." However, instead of mediating interests, the government introduces its economic and political interest into the dynamics of the university. One case can be used as an illustration. Since the rector Barros Sierra supported - or, at least, did not banish- the 1968 student protest, a group within the government pressed the university by delaying the accustomed installments of money. Barros Sierra presented his resignation to the governing board because, he said, "...my position as rector is untenable in the face of the open aggressiveness of a governmental group against me."[47]

In other occasions, however, it is the government which has been publicly pressed by the university, its professors, or its students. The case is that the government depends upon the UNAM for some legitimacy, for middle-class political support, and even for political recruitment. As Levy found, the government wants to reduce the financial

burden of funding the UNAM's operation, but the university charges the government with the "social responsibility" of supporting tuition-free higher education in order to promote the social and economic development of the country.

The most influential factor in the fate of the UNAM -and all other public universities in Mexico- is the federal government. Because of its particular history, the UNAM has now a salient role in Mexican politics. Even though the university is formally an autonomous institution, it suffers from constant intervention -direct and indirect- from government quarters. Conversely, the UNAM, and especially its students and professors have been capable of influencing educational and other policies of the federal government.

Notes to Chapter III.- The National Autonomous University of Mexico: A case of university governance.

[1] *Ley Organica de la Universidad de Guadalajara*. Guadalajara, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara, 1952.

[2] Gill, Clark C. *Education in a Changing Mexico*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and Institute of International Studies, 1969. p. 71

[3] Levy., Daniel. Op. Cit. p . 50

[4] ANUIES. Memoria de la XXII Reunion Ordinaria de la Asamblea General de la Anuies. *Revista de la Educacion Superior*. Vol. 15, No. 4 (60) Oct-Dec. 1986. p. 65. ERIC Document No. ED297609 HE020189

[5] International Association of Universities. *International Handbook of Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education*. Paris; International Association of Universities, 1988. p. 741-742

[6] International Association of Universities. Op. Cit. p. 785

[7] International Association of Universities. Op. Cit.p. 777 and 785

[8] Levy, Daniel. Op. Cit.p. 42

[9] Knowles, Asa. op. cit. Vol. 6, p. 2851

[10] Levy, Daniel. Op. cit. p. 139-40

[11] Levy, Daniel. Op. Cit. p. 142

[12] Levy, Daniel Op. Cit. p.139

[13] Guevara Niebla, Gilberto. "Tesis sobre la Universidad." *Universidad de Mexico*. Vol. XLIII, No. 453, Oct-Dec. 1988. p. 19

[14] Haussman, Fay. "Mexico's Oxbridge". *Change* Vol. 11, No. 6, p. 14-15, Sep. 1979. p. 15

[15] Padilla Lopez, Raul. "Inaugural Address of his Rectorship at the University of Guadalajara." Guadalajara, Mexico: University of Guadalajara. April 1st., 1989. p. 2

[16] Osborn, Thomas Noel. *Higher Education in Mexico. History, Growth, and Problems in a Dichotomized Industry*. El Paso, Texas: Center for Inter-American Studies, 1976, p. 8

[17] Knowles, Asa. *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978. Vol. 6, p. 2848

[18] Osborn, Thomas Noel. *Higher Education in Mexico*....Op. Cit. p. 11

[19] Phillip II of Spain, quoted by Sanchez, George I. *The Development of Higher Education in Mexico*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1944, p. 66. The next paragraph in the quotation (for historical curiosity) reads: "*We, therefore, because of our great love and our desire to favor and honor those who live in our Indies, and in order to banish the darkness of ignorance from there forever, hereby create, establish, and order to be founded in the city of Lima, of the Kingdom of Peru, and in the city of Mexico, of New Spain, a university or center of general studies respectively, and it is our will to grant to all those persons that may be graduated in the said universities the enjoyment of all privileges and exemptions in our Indies, Islands, and Tierra Firme de Mar Oceano, now enjoyed by those who are graduated by the University of Salamanca.*"

[20] Gonzalez Cosío, Arturo. *Mexico: Cuatro Ensayos de Sociologia Politica*. Mexico: UNAM, Facultad de Ciencias Politicas y Sociales. Serie Estudios No. 28, 1972. p. 20

[21] Sanchez, George I. *The Development of Higher Education in Mexico*. Op. Cit. p. 69

[22] Wilson, Irma. *Mexico: A Century of Educational Thought*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974. p. 330

[23] Quoted by Sanchez, George I. *The Development of Higher Education in Mexico*. Op. Cit. p. 69

[24] Wilson, Irma. op. cit. p. 331

[25] Quoted by Acosta, Salvador. "Caracteristicas de la Politica Educativa Mexicana, 1917-1934." Mimeographed, 1986. p. 8

[26] Portantiero, Juan Carlos. *Estudiantes y Politica en America Latina: El Proceso de la Reforma Universitaria (1918-1938)*. Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1978. p. 283

[27] Agustin Henriquez Ureña, quoted by Portantiero, Juan Carlos. Ibid. p. 56

[28] Levy, Daniel C. *University and Government in Mexico. Autonomy in an Authoritarian System*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980. p. 26

[29] Levy, Daniel. *University and Government*... Op. Cit. p. 48

[30] Levy, Daniel. *University and Government*... Op. Cit.p. 92

[31] Art. 77, quoted by Garcia Laguardia, Jorge Mario. "Fundamentos Juridicos de la Autonomia Universitaria. Legislacion sobre personalidad juridica y nomenclatura institucional en Mexico." *Universidades*. UDUAL, Mexico. No. 96, Apr-Jun, 1984. p. 107

[32] Ibid. p. 117

[33] Mabry, Donald J. *The Mexican University and the State: Student Conflicts 1910-1971*. College Station, Tex.: Texas A&M University Press, 1984. p. 187

[34] Knowles, Asa. *International Encyclopedia* ...Op. Cit. Vol. 6, p. 2851

[35] Gonzalez Oropeza, Manuel. *Génesis de la Ley Orgánica de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*. Mexico: UNAM, 1980. p. 68-71

[36] McGinn, Noel F. and Susan L. Street. *Higher Education Policies in Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin, 1980. p. 1

[37] Actually, Michael Burke provides some evidence as to how the university began to be challenged by the "revolucionarios" in the early 1910s. He asserts that mainly two schools, the National Preparatory and the National School of Advanced Studies, became targets of the Revolution. See "The University of Mexico and the Revolution." *The Americas*. Vol 34, No. 2 Oct. 1977, p. 252-273

[38] Trow, Martin. *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

[39] Lomnitz, Larissa. "Conflict and Mediation in a Latin American University." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*. Vol. 19, No. 3, 1977, p. 316

[40] Shapira, Yoram. "Mexico: The Impact of the 1968 Student Protest on Echeverria's Reformism." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*. Vol. 19, No. 4, 1977. p. 563

[41] McGinn, Noel F. and Susan L. Street. *Higher Education Policies* ... Op. Cit. p. 2

[42] Shapira, Yoram. "Mexico: The Impact of the 1968...Op. Cit. p. 561

[43] Ibid. p. 566-569

[44] Lomnitz, Larissa. "Conflict and Mediation... Op. Cit. p. 318

[45] Ashby, Sir Eric. *Universities: British, Indian, African.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966. Cited by Robert O. Berdahl. *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

[46] Levy, Daniel C. *University and Government in Mexico...* Op. Cit. p. 142, and Camp, Roderic A. " Intellectuals, Agents of Change in Mexico?" *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs.* Vol. 23, No. 3, Aug. 1981, p. 310

[47] García Cantú, Gastón. *Javier Barros Sierra, 1968.* Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1972. p. 200, note 17.

Chapter IV.- Conclusions

As this thesis has shown, the structure and means of university governance in France, the United States, and Mexico are very different. Also different are the processes of evolution and/or change of those means. In theoretical terms, perhaps those changes can be adequately addressed by a combination of concepts drawn from two theoretical frameworks: the political model developed by J. Victor Baldridge (1971 and 1978) and the theory of organizational structure outlined by Jeffrey Pfeffer (1978). The first one assumes that modern universities are complex professionalized organizations and, therefore, they function as bureaucracies in the sense that they have developed formal structures among their components and formal relationships among their members. The political model also offers an approach as to how very often the decision making process is conducted: sometimes decision making is a product of conflict, confrontation, and negotiation and sometimes it is the resultant of a long process of cumulative bureaucratic processes. Pfeffer's approach offers a logical explanation as to how some types of decision making acquires a structural or institutional dimension and become visible. He has suggested that the organizational structure of an institution is a "picture" of its governance. In other words, the formal, bureaucratic structure of an organization, to some extent

reflects the internal and external forces and the balance of power existent among them.

Naturally, different organizational structures, as those of the universities in the three countries analyzed, are the product of different processes and social environments. In this thesis, however, the usefulness of such theories has been only applied to the American case. No attempt was made, however, to explain the changes in university governance in France and Mexico by using those theoretical approaches and testing their usefulness in such a task.

Major Changes

From the information presented for each one of the countries it is possible to outline some major changes in university governance in the three countries. In France, during the nineteenth century and not before the 1968 reform, the positions having extensive powers to govern universities were those of the ministry of education, rectors of academies, and deans of faculties. The reforms of 1968 and 1983 granted the presidents of French universities more responsibilities, and now they seem to have more power in the decision-making process of guiding the universities. One of the reasons for such distribution of authority is that individual faculties enjoyed, before 1968, a great deal of autonomy in academic matters. This situation, along with the

dominant role of the government in funding, hiring, and firing professors, combined to produce university presidents with weak powers.

The presidential system, established by the 1968 law and enforced by the Socialist government, implied a re-distribution of authority in French higher education and set in motion the possibility of university differentiation. Before 1968, the prospects for university diversification and individual development of each institution were almost unthinkable. Van de Graaff (1978) noted the weak condition of the universities because of the excessive power being held by senior professors over new academic programs, research programs, and academic innovation.

The most striking change in university structure and government in France was, however, the breaking down, in 1968, of the traditional structure of faculties mainly governed by senior professors grouped in faculty councils. The reorganization of all university academic programs in new organizational units - the *unités d'enseignement et de recherche* (UERs) - meant the re-arrangement of faculty power and its opening to participation by students and junior professors.

In Mexico, the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), has been struggling since the 1920s for a real autonomy from the powers of the state. The governmental pressure over it is often enormous because the UNAM, as the

first university in the country and the largest one, sets a pattern for the rest of the public universities. In 1944, the UNAM generated its own Organic Law and the government sanctioned it. Since then no major change in university governance has taken place, although the present structure has been challenged in several occasions, some of them with public demonstrations and student strikes as happened in 1966 and 1986-87. Instead, there seems to have occurred a strengthening of the central administration in dealing with major university decisions. The UNAM's struggle for autonomy has been aggravated by the fact that it receives nearly ninety percent of its funds from the federal government. The UNAM contends its autonomy must be inviolable, while the government claims some control of the university's development.

In the United States, the major changes over time in university governance are not as dramatic as have been in France, nor imperceptible as in the UNAM. Five areas of university governance, however, have been transformed.

a) Strong university presidents seem to be a national pattern since the last quarter of the nineteenth century, although the image of them has shifted from one of strong academic leadership to a more entrepreneurial one.

b) Concomitant to the expansion of individual institutions, the building of state-wide systems, and the general growth of the system, an expansion of central

administrations for universities has occurred. Formalization of the institutional life and growth of a professional bureaucracy has become a feature in large colleges and universities.

c) Over the last fifty years, state governments have become more deeply involved in American higher education. Some have established state-wide governing boards while others keep only coordinating boards. Constituencies integrating the state boards, regulatory powers, and coordinating functions vary widely across the states. Almost every state, however, has nowadays a type of coordinating board claiming subordination of the individual institutions' plans to a broad and rational development of the state system.

d) Some changes have occurred in the role of academic senates in university governance. Some of them are related to the surge of faculty unions, others to the consolidation of a professional university administration. Again, a broad variation in faculty role in governance is found among states and institutions (Baldridge, 1978), but the general picture seems to show what Trow (1989) labeled as cogovernance, a division of decision making between administration and professors in which the latter deals with typically administrative issues while the latter takes charge of the academic ones.

e) Finally, the burgeoning of faculty unions in American higher education in the 1960s and 1970s was another change in the steering of colleges and universities. Collective bargaining, however, receded in the 1980s, but has not disappeared from the landscape of university governance. Apparently, the current tendency is one of faculty senates and faculty unions intertwining and complementing each other as the need arises(Williams and Zirkel, 1988).

Some Questions

A research process often opens more questions than those it answers. In this particular case and after reviewing a general description of three different systems university organization and governance, the feeling is that only then one can begin to ask more relevant questions. Some of these questions may be: How does organizational change of universities take place in different countries with diverse economic development, social institutions, and cultural traditions? What are the main factors, forces, or elements that foster or prevent change in university organization and governance? How does the process of change interact (influences and is influenced) with social forces outside the university community? How does it differ, and in what directions, crossnationaly?

From the information presented in this thesis, some elements can be isolated as common denominators of

transformations in the forms of university governance in the three countries analyzed here:

a) *Increases in student enrollment* and consequent expansion and (often) diversification of the system of higher education. This element was highlighted in Trow's thesis (1973) of American higher education transition from elite to mass higher education. Indeed, since the Second World War, the three systems of higher education have experienced a dramatic increase in the number of students demanding higher education. Many incremental transformations of higher education were imperceptibly prompted by the growing numbers of college students.

b) The nature of the *relationships that universities develop with the government*, or the degree of involvement of national, state or local government in the governing of universities. In fact, in the present analysis, the role of the state is one of the huge differences between France and Mexico on one side, and the USA on the other side. Except for the Land Grant universities of the 19th century, the federal government did not play a significant role as promoter of the American higher education system. Even though the states were active promoters of education, many American colleges and universities were founded by private initiative. On the contrary, in France, it was the state which founded in the early 19th century the Imperial University, and which supported the development of the grandes écoles. The chapter

on France has shown how the universities there strongly depend on the government not only for funding but also for policy making and structural innovation.

Similarly to France, the Mexican revolutionary government launched a broad educational campaign in the 1920s with fateful effects in the future of the system: the establishment of a national ministry for public education, and autonomy for the UNAM. In the French as well as the Mexican case, the government initiatives were guided by economic and strategic motives: to provide experts to serve the new state and to prepare professionals for the economic development of the country. As a consequence of the public interest in higher education, universities in Mexico and France are closely linked to the state and, therefore, to the politics of government. This is more clear in the case of Mexico where the UNAM has been used as headquarters for political activity by some groups of students, professors, and, often, by the central administration. This involvement in political activity has been both for and against the government. The 1968 student movement, mainly generated and sustained by UNAM students, questioned the centralism, authoritarianism, and the undemocratic character of the federal government.

b) Another element related to government politics is the presence of *political parties in the universities*. No evidence of party politics was found in the exploration of

university governance in the United States. On the contrary, both in Mexican and French universities, political parties have members among students and professors, a situation which originates the display of party politics through university activities. In the case of the UNAM, many Mexican authors agree that given the strong centralism in government decision making, some political parties and students find in the autonomy of universities an excellent sheltered space to contest the central government.

d) *The place occupied by the students* in university formal organization and the structure of power. The power of the students in the UNAM (and most Mexican universities) is directly reflected in their participation in university governing bodies, especially university general councils. Their participation has therefore gained a structural dimension, although they do not intervene in university administration. In the case of France, students and junior professors have been a strong force in opposition to some government policies regarding higher education and to the senior professors and university formal authorities. In the United States, student participation in university decision making is not so evident as it is in Mexico and France. Students' role in university governance, however, was not analyzed in this thesis.

The 1968 student movement in France and Mexico impacted strongly the two countries, although they had quite

different results in the higher education system of the two countries. In France, the student protest led to a radical transformation of university organization under the auspices of the 1968 Orientation Law of Higher Education while in Mexico, the government replied with a cruel repression of the students and, only two years later under a new government administration, a new policy for higher education institutions was inaugurated. The French student demonstrations prompted a far-reaching university reform, while in Mexico the outcome was far from a reorganization of the system. Increases in federal funding for universities was the late response of the government to the complaints of the Mexican students in 1968. As to the United States, it seems that no significant change was produced by the student unrest of the 1960s, although, again, this subject was not studied in this thesis.

Overall differences among the systems of higher education analyzed in the three countries seem to be those regarding the issues of centralization and/or decentralization. France and Mexico are essentially systems of higher education strongly centralized or excessively dependent upon government will for innovation and transformation, with the consequence that homogeneity among institutions is an essential feature of these systems. In the United States, to the contrary, each university has a different set of academic programs and each one places part

of its pride in its distinctive character, since innovation and differentiation are much more valued than imitation in the American culture.

Bibliography

Altbach, Philip G & David H. Kelly. *Higher Education in International Perspective. A Survey and Bibliography.* London: Mansell Publishing Limited, 1985.

Altbach, Philip G.*Comparative Higher Education Abroad. Bibliography and Analysis.* New York: Praeger, 1976.

Ambler, John S. "Constraints on Policy Innovation in Education. Thatcher's Britain and Mitterrand's France." *Comparative Politics.* Vol. 20, No. 1 October 1987.

Ambler, John S. "French Education and the Limits of Autonomy." *Western Political Quarterly.* Vol. 41, No. 3, (Sept. 1988) p. 472

Ambler, John S. "The Politics of French University Reform: Ten Years after May." *Contemporary French Civilization.* Fall 1980, Vol. III, No. 1.

American Association of University Professors. "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." *AAUP Bulletin.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, Winter, 1966.

ANUIES. Memoria de la XXII Reunion Ordinaria de la Asamblea General de la Anuies. *Revista de la Educacion Superior.* Vol. 15, No. 4 (60) Oct-Dec. 1986. p. 65. ERIC Document No. ED297609 HE020189.

Baldridge, J. Victor & Frank R. Kemerer. "Academic Senates and Faculty Collective Bargaining." In Riley, Gary L. and J. Victor Baldridge (Eds.) *Governing Academic Organizations.* Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan, 1977.

Baldridge, J. Victor (Ed). *Policy Making and Effective Leadership. A National Study of Academic Management.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldridge, J. Victor. (Ed.) *Academic Governance. Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making.* Berkeley, CA. McCutchan Pub. Co., 1971.

Barnard, H. C. *Education and the French Revolution.* Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Berdahl, Robert *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Bienayme, Alain. "The New Reform in French Higher Education." *European Journal of Education.* Vol 19, No. 2, 1984.

Bienaymé, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education*: France. New York: International Council for Educational Development - Interbook, 1978.

Bonner, Thomas N. "The Unintended Revolution In America's Colleges Since 1940." *Change*. Sept-Oct, 1986.

Burke, Michael. "The University of Mexico and the Revolution." *The Americas*. Vol 34, No. 2 Oct. 1977.

Camp, Roderic A. " Intellectuals, Agents of Change in Mexico?" *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*. Vol. 23, No. 3, Aug. 1981.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987. Foreword by Ernest L Boyer.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Control of the Campus: a report on the governance of higher education*. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982.

Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Organization and Authority." In Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge, *Governing Academic Organizations*. Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan Pub. Co.,1977.

Clark, Burton R. "Academic Power: Concepts, Modes, and Perspectives." in *Academic Power: Patterns of authority in seven national systems of higher education*. John Van de Graaff (Ed). New York: Praeger, 1978.

Clark, Burton R. "United States." In *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. John H. Van de Graaff (Ed). New York: Praeger, 1978.

Clark, Burton R. *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Clark, Burton R. *The School and University: An International Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Cohen, Habiba S. *Elusive Reform: The French Universities, 1968-1978*. Boulder, Col. Westview Press, 1978

Cope, Robert G. *"Observations on Washington State's system of higher education with particular attention to the*

relationship between state government and the institutions: A report to the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education." Mimeographed, 1979.

Cowen, Robert. "International Research on Higher Education." In UNESCO. *International Directory of Research Institutions on Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO-European Centre for Higher Education, 1987.

Cowley, W.H. and Williams, Don. *Historical and International Roots of American Higher Education*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1991. In print.

Eurich, Nell P. *Systems of Higher Education in Twelve Countries. A Comparative View*. New York: Praeger, 1981.

Garcia Laguardia, Jorge Mario. "Fundamentos Juridicos de la Autonomia Universitaria. Legislacion sobre personalidad juridica y nomenclatura institucional en Mexico." *Universidades*. UDUAL, Mexico. No. 96, Apr-Jun, 1984.

García Cantú, Gastón. *Javier Barros Sierra, 1968*. Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1972.

Gill, Clark C. *Education in a Changing Mexico*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and Institute of International Studies, 1969.

Goldschmidt, Dietrich. "Systems of Higher Education." In *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. John H. Van de Graaff, (ed). New York: Praeger, 1978.

Gonzalez Cosío, Arturo. *Mexico: Cuatro Ensayos de Sociologia Politica*. Mexico: UNAM, Facultad de Ciencias Politicas y Sociales. Serie Estudios No. 28, 1972.

Gonzalez Oropeza, Manuel. *Génesis de la Ley Orgánica de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*. Mexico: UNAM, 1980.

Grignon, C. and Passeron, J. C. *Case Studies on Innovation in Higher Education. French experience before 1968*. Paris: OECD, 1970.

Guevara Niebla, Gilberto (ed). *La Crisis de la Educacion Superior en Mexico*. Mexico: Ed. Nueva Imagen, 1981. (Reprinted 1989)

Guevara Niebla, Gilberto. "Tesis sobre la Universidad." *Universidad de Mexico*. Vol. XLIII, No. 453, Oct-Dec. 1988.

Haussman, Fay. "Mexico's Oxbridge". *Change* Vol. 11, No. 6, Sep. 1979.

Hawley, Amos H., Walter Boland, and Margaret Boland. "Population Size and Administration in Institutions of Higher Education." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 30, 1965.

International Association of Universities. *International Handbook of Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education*. Paris; International Association of Universities, 1988.

Keeler, John T.S. "Opening the window for Reform: Mandates, Crises and Extraordinary Policymaking." Paper presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the American Political Association. August 30-September 2.

Kerr, Clark. *12 Systems of Higher Education. 6 Decisive Issues*. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1978.

Knowles, Asa. *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978. Vol. 6.

Lamoure Rontopolou, Jeanne and Jean Lamoure. "French University Education: a brief overview, 1984-1987." *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 23, Nos. 1/2.

Lapointe, Serge. "Autonomy and Management of Institutions of Higher Education in France." *Institutional Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*. Vol. 6, No. 3.

Law No. 68-978 of November 12, 1968 for the Orientation of Higher Education. In Bienayme, Alain. *Systems of Higher Education: France*. International Council for Educational Development, 1978.

Levy, Daniel C. *University and Government in Mexico. Autonomy in an Authoritarian System*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980.

Lewis, H.D. *The French Education System*. London: Croom Helm, 1985.

Ley Organica de la Universidad de Guadalajara. Guadalajara, Mexico: Universidad de Guadalajara, 1952.

Lomnitz, Larissa. "Conflict and Mediation in a Latin American University." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*. Vol. 19, No. 3, 1977.

Mabry, Donald J. *The Mexican University and the State: Student Conflicts 1910-1971*. College Station, Tex.: Texas A&M University Press, 1984.

McGinn, Noel and Susan L. Street. *Higher Education Policies in Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas at Austin, 1980.

Neave, Guy. "On the Cultivation of Quality, Efficiency and Enterprise: an overview of recent trends in higher education in Western Europe, 1986-1987." *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 23, Nos. 1-2.

Neave, Guy. "Strategic Planning, Reform and Governance in French Higher Education." *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 10, No. 1, 1985.

Osborn, Thomas Noel. *Higher Education in Mexico. History, Growth, and Problems in a Dichotomized Industry*. El Paso, Texas. Center for Inter-American Studies, 1976.

Padilla Lopez, Raul. "Inaugural Address of his Rectorship at the University of Guadalajara." Guadalajara, Mexico: University of Guadalajara. April 1st., 1989.

Parsons, Talcott & Gerald M. Platt. *The American University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "The Micropolitics of Organization." In Marshal W. Meyer and Associates, *Environments and Organizations*. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Portantiero, Juan Carlos. *Estudiantes y Politica en America Latina: El Proceso de la Reforma Universitaria (1918-1938)*. Mexico: Siglo Veintiuno, 1978.

Premfors, Rune. "Institutional Governance in Higher Education: Policy Implementation in France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom." *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education*. Vol. 4, No. 1, March 1980.

Ross, George. "From one Left to Another. *Le Social* in Mitterrand's France." In *The Mitterrand Experiment*. George Ross, Stanley Hoffman and Sylvia Malzacher Eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Sanchez, George I. *The Development of Higher Education in Mexico*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1944. (Reprinted in 1970).

Shapira, Yoram. "Mexico: The Impact of the 1968 Student Protest on Echeverria's Reformism." *Journal of*

Interamerican Studies and World Affairs. Vol. 19, No. 4, 1977.

Smelser, Neil J. "Epilogue" In Parsons & Platt. *The American University*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Stocking, Carol. "The United States." In Burton R. Clark.*The School and University: An International Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Suleiman, Ezra N. *Elites in French Society: The Politics of Survival*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

The Almanac of Higher Education, 1989-90. Chicago: The Editors of the Chronicle of Higher Education, The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Trow, Martin. "American Higher Education-past, present, and future." *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol. 14, No. 1, 1989.

Trow, Martin. *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.

Trow, Martin. "The Academic Senate as a School for University Leadership." *Liberal Education*. Vol 76, No.1 (Jan-Feb, 1990).

Trow, Martin. "The Expansion and Transformation of Higher Education." *The International Review of Education*. Vol. 18, No.1, 1972.

Van de Graaff, John and Dorotea Furth. "France." In *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. John Van de Graaff (Ed). New York: Praeger, 1978.

Van de Graaff, John H. "The Politics of Innovation in French Higher Education: The University Institutes of Technology." *Higher Education*. Vol. 5, 1976.

Van de Graaff, John. (Ed). *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*. New York: Praeger, 1978.

Weisz, George._*The Emergence of Modern Universities in France, 1863-1914*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Williams, Gwen B. and Perry A. Zirkel. "Academic Penetration in Faculty Collective Bargaining Contracts in Higher

Education." *Research in Higher Education*. Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 76-94

Wilson, Irma. *Mexico: A Century of Educational Thought*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974.

Zeldin, Theodore. "Higher Education in France, 1845-1945." *Journal of Contemporary History*. Vol. II, No. 3 (Jul) 1967.

Zumeta, William. "Higher Education Policy." In Williams, Walter (Ed) *Washington Policy Choices 1990s*. Seattle, Wa: Institute of Public Policy and Management, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington, 1990.

Salvador Acosta Romero

Born December 2, 1950 in Etzatlán, Jalisco, Mexico.

Address: Instituto de Estudios Sociales
Universidad de Guadalajara
Liceo Esq. Juan Alvarez, 7o. Piso
44280 Guadalajara, Jalisco
Mexico.

EDUCATION:

Economics, University of Guadalajara, Mexico. 1975

Diploma in Educational Administration, National Institute of Public Administration (INAP), Mexico City, 1987-1988.

Master of Education, University of Washington, 1991

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE:

Director, Regional Center for Educational Technology, University of Guadalajara, 1983-1989.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

Researcher, Institute for Social Studies, University of Guadalajara, 1976-